DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 402 SO 016 117

AUTHOR	Loring, Katherine, Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Seeing Our Way Clear: Feminist Revision of the Academy. Proceedings of the Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference (8th, November 5-7, 1981).
INSTITUTION	Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, MI. Women's Studies Program.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	105p.; For proceedings of other conferences, see SO 016 113-116.
AVAILABLE FROM	GLCA Women's Studies Program, 220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, MI 48103 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; *Feminism; Films; Higher Education; Homosexuality; Integrated Curriculum; Literature; Mathematics Education; Religion; Scholarship; Science Careers; Sex Bias; Sex Fairness; Violence; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Heroines; Homophobia; Ideology; Women in Literature

ABSTRACT

Two keynote addresses and 12 selected papers are included in these conference proceedings. The keynote address, "Seeing Our Way Clear: Feminist Re-Vision of the Academy" (Peggy McIntosh), describes the academy as a "hierarchical or layered pyramidal structure" and discusses the benefits of feminist revision. The first of 12 selected papers is entitled "The Evolution of the Woman Scientist" (Laurel Sherman). Three papers portraying heroic images of women are "The Artist as Hero in Maxine Hong Kingston's 'The Woman Warrior'" (Warren Rosenberg), "'Song of Solomon': The Hero With a Woman's Face" (Gail Griffin), and "Images of Women in Film" (Starla Stensaas). Articles dealing with violence against women are "Captured Angel in the Centerfold" (Janet Swim) and "The Hurt that Lasts Forever" (Karmen Meyer). A seventh paper, "Broaching the Issue: Homophobia" (Audrey Glenn and Jane Dickie), defines homophobia and resulting myths about homosexuality. The next paper, "Increasing Female Participation in the Mathematics Classroom" (Pansy Brunson), focuses on the continuing low enrollment of women in mathematics classes. Other papers include "The Problem: Idealism and Accommodation in the Feminist Transformation of the Academy" (Linnea Vacca), "Know Your Heroines" (Ann Loux), "Communication or Collusion? Maneuvering Through the Maze of Patriarchal Theology" (Linell Cady), and "American Female Dramatists: Show But No Go?" (Julie Jensen). A final keynote presentation, "The Whole Thing: In Search of Relevance and Integration Made Dynamic By Creativity" (Mary Beth Edelson), a closing keynote address, "When We Dream Together" (Barbara Zanotti), and a schedule of conference events conclude the document. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251402

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katherine Loring

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Copyright ©1983 by the GLCA Women's Studies Program
220 Collingwood, Suite 240, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening Keynote Address: SEEING OUR WAY CLEAR: FEMINIST RE-VISION OF THE ACADEMY

Peggy McIntosh 1

Selected Papers:

THE EVOLUTION OF THE WOMAN SCIENTIST

Laurel Sherman 15

HEROIC IMAGES OF WOMEN

THE ARTIST AS HERO IN MAXINE HONG KINGSTON'S THE WOMAN WARRIOR

Warren Rosenberg 23

SONG OF SOLOMON: THE HERO WITH A WOMAN'S FACE

Gail Griffin 27

IMAGES OF WOMEN IN FILM

Starla Stensaas 33

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: PORNOGRAPHY, INCEST, AND THERAPEUTIC ISSUES

CAPTURED ANGEL IN THE CENTERFOLD

Janet Swim 37

THE HURT THAT L STS FOREVER

Karmen Meyer 45

BROACHING THE ISSUE: HOMOPHOBIA

Audrey Glenn and Jane Dickie 52

INCREASING FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM

Pansy Brunson 61

PANEL: BEING SENSIBLE OR SELLING OUT?

THE PROBLEM: IDEALISM AND ACCOMMODATION IN THE FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY

Linnea Vacca 67

KNOW YOUR HEROINES

Ann Loux 70

COMMUNICATION OR COLLUSION?: MANEUVERING THROUGH THE MAZE OF PATRIARCHAL THEOLOGY

Linell Cady 75

AMERICAN FEMALE DRAMATISTS: SHOW BUT NO GO?

Julie Jensen 78

Keynote Presentation: THE WHOLE THING: IN SEARCH OF RELEVANCE AND INTEGRATION MADE DYNAMIC BY CREATIVITY

Mary Beth Edelson 81

Closing Keynote Address: WHEN WE DREAM TOGETHER

Barbara Zanotti 89

Schedule of Conference Events 93

The papers and addresses in this publication are edited versions of the Conference presentations.

The Great Lakes Colleges Association includes the following institutions: Albion College, Antioch College, Denison University, DePauw University, Earlham College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, Wabash College, and The College of Wooster.

OPENING KEYNOTE ADDRESS

SEEING OUR WAY CLEAR: FEMINIST RE-VISION OF THE ACADEMY

Peggy McIntosh, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women

I am particularly pleased to have been asked to give a talk at this conference because, like many people in other parts of the country, I admire the GLCA Women's Studies consortium and have benefitted from reading the Proceedings from earlier conferences. It is an honor for me to feel I am standing in a line with the speakers whom you have invited here previously, including Florence Howe, Sheila Tobias, Elaine Reuben, Elizabeth Janeway, and Elizabeth Minnich. I feel that Adrienne Rich also figuratively stands here in the line, since the conference organizers have distributed her "Toward a Woman-Centered University" for reading by us all, and her ideas are very much in the air. I agree with whoever said that in feminism the work is done by individuals but the thinking is collective. My talk today borrows from and elaborates on much thought which has been stimulated by these GLCA Women's Studies conferences. It is good to be in on the making of this collective fabric.

The title of my talk comes from the conference title: "Seeing Our Way Clear: Feminist Revision of the Academy." I have chosen to hyphenate the word "revision" so that it becomes "re-vision" and can be taken two ways. Revision can mean the reseeing of something in a new light. I will resee the academy. Revision can also mean the redoing of something so as to produce a different effect or outcome. I will imagine a revised academy which serves the society and the self in new ways.

I see the academy as a hierarchical or layered pyramidal structure. I also see it as a microcosm of our whole culture and as a reflection or macrocosm of our individual personality structures within the culture. The academy validates only a small amount of human work, only a tiny sample of human life, and only a small part of the personality. I want to use a feminist lens to look at the hierarchies of the academy, the culture, and the personality. I will then argue that all the work and people and functions of personality which the academy trains us to overlook or disparage are, when newly perceived through the feminist lens, correctly seen as the best resources for our collective and personal survival. Moreover, the work, people, and functions of personality which the academy trains us to think are at the "top" of human possibilities are seen through the feminist lens to be partial, distorted, and even dangerous. A feminist revision allows us to challenge the value systems we were taught and to imagine institutions and personalities which would honor the work done at what was previously seen as the bottom layer of the existing pyramids of power. The revised academy would honor and develop fully the functions which go into making and maintaining life on an ordinary day-to-day basis, and it would upgrade these functions so that they were seen as central and necessary in academic, political, and personal life. The tops of the academic and other hierarchies, which now carry most power and prestige, would be seen as places which have some virtues but also as places where people are likely to get disconnected from the ordinary life and therefore become dangerous to us. A revised academy would work for the deconstruction of hierarchies, inner and outer, and the construction of a life in which the decent survival of all persons and functions of personality is a central ideal.

Copyright © Peggy McIntosh, 1983

I want to start by looking at the layered structure of the academy and the value system which has been inherent in its layers. As I have said, I see the academy as a microcosm of the stratified structure and value system of our present dominant culture. Though colleges and universities build an image of themselves as working for the betterment of society and as somewhat independent of the major structures of our society, in fact they embody and mirror the hierarchies, value systems, and political arrangements of the larger structure. I will be using the status of women and of Women's Studies in the academy to illustrate this statement, but first I want to qualify it a little. I think that the United States is a little less hierarchical in its academies and its citizens' personality structures than are most other countries. Moreover, certain regions of the United States are less obviously hierarchical than others; the midwest may differ from New England in this respect, and often rural regions differ from cities. In addition, the GLCA colleges which you come from may not fit my hierarchical model entirely; most of them already have practice in forming consortia, and in reaching across disciplinary and college boundaries to make a network of programs and values which conveys collaborative rather than competitive values.

Nevertheless, I have consulted on many college campuses in the course of working with people who are trying to change the curriculum. And the shadow of the structures that I am going to describe—the shadow of the layered structure reflecting our military, corporate, governmental, and professional and internal hierarchies—hangs over every college I have ever visited. Even if it is not immediately present in the way things are done and in patronizing attitudes towards students and dedicated classroom teachers, the sense of layered structure hangs over every college as it hangs over Harvard in the East or Stanford and Berkeley in the West. It presides in the background, and it does taint the atmosphere.

The large research university is the basis of my model here. I will analyze it as a pyramidal structure. The people in it function, in order of descending prestige, as scholars, then as administrators, teachers, and advisors, then as students, secretaries, and custodians, and then at the bottom as Women's Studies teachers. I have placed these groups in order according to what I take to be their status and perceived value in the large private research university in particular.

At the very top of the pyramid of a major research university, in terms of prestige and pay and status, are found eminent professors of international reputation, whose fame and prestige and levels of funding are such that they are relieved of all or nearly all teaching duties. Below this group come the faculty who teach graduate students and in some cases undergraduates, who have national reputations and attract students from some distance specifically to work with them. These professors have considerable status, but usually not as much as those relieved of teaching duties. Then come faculty who specialize in teaching, who like undergraduates, and/or who do some administration, such as running the Freshman English program. These people often have campus-wide reputations. They rarely have national or international ones. They may do vital administrative work in holding things together, but such work is not highly valued in the pyramidal system. Many such instructors have a major investment in teaching, and are willing or even eager to teach students who are not majoring in their fields. They usually differ from the most elite "scholars" in welcoming students who do not yet have a pre-professional vocabulary and clear professional aspirations.

The work done by these teacher/administrator caretakers is vital to any university but counts for much less than does the work done by an eminent specialist who is seen to be at the cutting edge of theory or discovery and who is writing for an international network of people who follow his—and it usually is "his"—work.

Among the least valued group of teachers are those who teach freshmen, or who specialize in teaching freshmen and sophomores. Many such instructors have strong reputations among students, but are not at all well-known otherwise within the university. Often they are not considered "scholarly" because they do not read papers at professional meetings or write with enthusiasm for publication.

Lower on the pyramid come those who devote time to student advising and counseling, and activities connected to student life. Such people often earn student friendship and gratitude, but on the scale of values of a research university or an elite college, popularity with mere students counts for very little, or can in fact be seen as downright suspect or indicative of populist leanings.

Toward the bottom of the university hierarchy come those who bring in the money by paying tuition, the students themselves. They are wooed and solicited as tuition payers, but their ideas and needs are usually given low priority in the arrangement of the whole academic structure. They support the university from the bottom rather than leading it from the top. Learners in general count in these structures for less than teachers. Not surprisingly, far less value attaches to the Dean of Students' office than to the Dean of the Faculty's office; the same is true for all of the functions performed by those offices.

Still lower in the structure than teachers and learners come the caretakers—the secretaries, clerks, and custodians whose work is central to the institution's survival and welfare but who are low on every scale of pay, prestige, and recognition.

Lowest of all in the structure, I think, utterly lacking in prestige and seen by some as potentially anti-social and anti-university, are those who might help the people filling lower-caste functions in this structure to see the entire system, in other words to re-see the academy, and in doing so to identify with each other. These include teachers of Women's Studies and Minority Studies, and all interdisciplinary teachers who might train students to see interlocking systems at work rather than individuals merely, and who might teach students to recognize the pyramids in our culture and the way they are replicated in most of our psyches and our courses as well as our institutions. Such teachers who can alert students to structures, rather than reinforcing the myth that the individual chooses the life she or he lives, can, in effect, blow the cover of the academy. They can reveal the extent to which it, like most institutions, enhances the power and prestige of a few at the expense of the many who support and maintain the base of the pyramid.

I have been describing a pyramidal shape which I have said is not universal, in that it fits private research universities better than other institutions. But I would say that even colleges which do not aspire to the pyramidal shape are judged nevertheless by their deviation from it. In the pyramidal shape I drew, you don't recognize Goddard College in Vermont. It doesn't aspire to be a layered hierarchy. Neither does it have power, prestige, and status in the eyes of the general public. I think that colleges and universities are in general ranked by the public, by professors, by the media, by funding agencies, and by public officials in terms of how closely they conform to the pattern I have laid out. The media spotlight those institutions which spotlight the soloist professors on the summits; Princeton gets far more public press than Grinnell College or Austin College will ever get. And indeed, from a practical point of view, "master scholars" are easier to interview and much easier to interpret to the general public than is the value structure of an entire institution trying to work in nontraditional ways.

I think that in the pyramidal rankings of colleges, suggested by the media and by tradition and shared by most of us at the unconscious level, those colleges which most focus on the professors on the pinnacles are ranked highest, and that liberal arts colleges which pay least attention to student needs and try hardest to encourage faculty to mimic, or to be, individual scholars of national renown have the highest reputations. Ranked a little lower in the hierarchies of public opinion are universities which recognize that people at the junior, senior, and early graduate level are really important to the structure. Still lower in power and value come the colleges really committed to the ideal of teaching for students rather than publication by faculty. Perhaps many of the GLCA colleges fit this description; I hope many do. But at the bottom, the very bottom in terms of public status, come those colleges which are genuinely student-oriented, like Goddard in Vermont, or Cape Cod Community College, or Marymount Manhattan. Those colleges which chiefly help students to live in the practical world and which stress vocational training, such as Metropolitan State College in Denver, are often considered to be actually anti-academic. Bizarrely, we are trained to think that those who work chiefly with students are anti-academy. The students and their needs, and teaching which alerts students to the realities of their own lives, are not seen to be the real stuff of "higher education."

These are the pyramidal shapes which I see when I look at the academy. For years, I accepted, because I could not see, these hierarchies and the value systems and political arrangements which they reinforced. Thanks to readings in the sociology of knowledge and in feminist theory, I began to see the hidden structures and then gradually to understand also how I and other women have so often fitted into these structures. We can learn both about women's preferences and about the strictures on us if we look for women everywhere in the pyramids of power which I have drawn.

We women are rarely found on the professional pinnacles, holding non-teaching research positions following single lines of research and amassing publications. Some of us are found in the next echelon. We are known as worth studying with, and in some cases graduate students may come from a distance especially to work with us.

At the next levels we are found in quantity. We are excellent at middle-level administration and at holding things together. Many of us really do a good job of teaching graduates and undergraduates. We are far likelier to have campus-wide reputations than to have national or international reputations. It is no accident that many of us teach a wide variety of non-specialized undergraduate courses. Lower still on the scale come the many women who teach freshmen and who enjoy it, who have very good reputations among students and who think of teaching as something richer, more congenial, and more important to their development than publication. Many of these teachers try to make their work in the classroom relate directly to daily life, and to the core of personality. Most also try to bridge the gap between teacher and student, between authority figure and "inferior," through a variety of strategies. Many such teachers, and I hope it's clear I'm talking not only about women but also about those men who've dared not to be the sex "opposite" to us, find that teaching undergraduates makes a full and rewarding life and consider that it should be the main business of the college or the university.

At the next level of the pyramid come large numbers of women, central to the university, who counsel and advise students and provide student services. Women and the few men who choose this level of the pyramid often make wonderful advisors and develop strong friendships with students. People who like advising tend to blur the line between the student and the advisor, to get the pyramid and its layers to dissolve a little. We rarely use phrases like "higher education." Many of us make friends from

all parts of the community. We are often distressed by the gap between what most professors are teaching and what most students understand. We care about the relationship between the college curriculum and the students' actual daily lives, and we worry about the gap between those theoretical abstractions which pass for "knowledge" and what is actually known on our pulses as facts from our daily lives. Analogously, many of us object to the tremendous difference between salaries paid to literary critics and salaries paid to those who staff composition programs, actually helping students to learn to write.

Below most of the faculty come the students, but I would number among them certain lower-echelon faculty who see themselves still as learners rather than as teachers. Many highly trained women do not entirely regret that we have been made to gravitate toward the bottom of those pyramids in the university, for we see ourselves as permanently somewhat like students—that is, not necessarily authority figures, but persons simultaneously both in front of the class and at the back of the room. Most of us who have elected to do teaching very seriously find that we shift minute by minute from being learner to being teacher. It is like living in a Mobius strip, a strip of paper which is twisted once and then pasted back together at its ends. If you run your finger around it, you start on one "side" and come back on the other "side" and then rejoin the point where your finger started. You cannot say at any point that you went from the front of the strip to the back; you have simply been around the whole surface. Most of us who have done the lower-echelon kind of teaching work and take it seriously find that we are on a kind of Mobius strip; when it comes to the question of which side of the desk we are on, we have to say both sides. To say this, however, in elite hierarchical structures is to create problems for ourselves, for we are blurring the line between the traditional "superior" (teacher) and the traditional "inferior" (student).

We come now, toward the bottom of the pyramid, to the mainly female department: secretaries, clerks, and custodians whose chief work is to make the whole structure function so that everyone survives decently. Their work carries low pay and low prestige, especially insofar as it is seen to be work "anyone" could do. In fact, many a department secretary is holding together a whole division of administrative incompetents. The whole of the university, like the whole civilization and the whole psyche, depends on the maintenance and upkeep functions.

At the very bottom of the hierarchies, and seen as potentially dangerous to the whole structure, are the groups including most women who might unite on the strength of their numbers and their common interests to say that their values, their interests, their needs, and their lived experience should be the focus and the stuff of education. The large research institution does all that it can to keep such a movement from threatening the stability of the pyramid and from distributing university or societal benefits more widely. Makers of curriculum show enormous resistance to all motions from the "bottom," motions from people who want to discuss life as it is lived, or the actual effects of life on most of us. Most professors resist Black Studies, Women's Studies, and all interdisciplinary work which might teach students to see interlocking oppressive systems at work. Such programs are perhaps less resisted at colleges like those in the GLCA consortium, which has made it possible to register the complaint, the analysis, and the vision for a different kind of future from the platform here sponsored by the GLCA Women's Studies Committee.

My diagram should bear out the idea that we women are found in the university structure in the same positions and with the same kinds of functions that we have in the culture at large. I suggest that this is due not only to discrimination against us

by those highly placed, but also to the fact that on account of our training as women, we gravitate toward those parts of the structure which correspond to the values we were both consciously and unconsciously taught, as women, to hold.

Let me analyze this by contrasting the values present at the top and at the bottom sections of the pyramid. It seems to me that the top is highly competitive, territorial, fragmented, vertical in orientation, limited in space, and therefore devoted to competitive paradigms and questions about whether the individual will win or lose, be promoted or let go, be a "success" or be a "failure." The scholar who is relieved of all teaching duties and is considered to have a great mind seems to me to be engaged usually in outlining and defending a small territory of which he is the feudal lord. Most of these feudal lords have a very strong territorial base, whatever their claims to be doing interdisciplinary thinking. Most have very little respect for that kind of intellectual work which involves the making of consortia, team work, or the crossing of disciplinary boundaries. Imagery of aggression fills the literature about the academic race, and it is not an accident that the definitive graduate thesis examination is called a "defense." The defense is a version of King on the Mountain, in which the dissertation writer tries not to get knocked off his pinnacle. In the upper spheres of the research university, conversation or colleagueship or humble learning from one another or from one's "inferiors" is almost absent. An aura of isolation prevails. Professors rarely know or care what goes on in others' classes, except as it bears on territoriality. It would be unheard of for two graduate professors in one department to give seminars on Hawthorne, because this would violate the principle of a pinnacle for each senior member of the department. Down at the level of the freshman English class, however, it is not seen to matter that all twenty-six instructors are assigned to cover The Scarlet Letter. The lower the territory, the less the competition.

We also find associated with the most prestigious professional ranks an emphasis on theory, or on quantification and empirical methods. When I say theory, I mean that for the professor on the pinnacle to be interested in sociology and sociological theory is one thing, but to be interested in social work is almost unheard of. It is a rare economics professor who is interested in what it is like to be poor. Those independent scholars who take a genuine interest in the practical running of our institutions are almost always found outside the university, and are engaged like Ivan Illich or Adrienne Rich in work which takes them away from professorships. Robert Coles of Harvard is a rare example of a person whose values do not correspond to those of the top of the pyramid, though he is structurally placed in such a way that he can enjoy the independence of life at the "top." More usually such people choose places outside the academy.

Those at the top of our academic structures often seem to me like the professors in Swift's Book III of Gulliver's Travels. The more abstract and theoretical the thinking, the more it is revered by the perpetuators of the system. I am also reminded of the Cambridge dons at hightable in Max Beerbohm's Zuleika Dobson, who didn't notice when all the undergraduates drowned themselves in the river and left the dining hall empty.

In the bottom layers of this structure, where most of the women and the people most useful to students are, the work involves far more daily teaching, rather than teaching of a once-a-week or once-a-month type. Classes meet often, papers come in frequently, and there is less sense that everything rides on one examination or one "defense." There is more conversation, more taking care of people, more give and take, more involvement of the teacher with the student. The value system is more lateral than vertical. Often teachers who like teaching have problems with grading, either because they have not subscribed to the standards for judgment in the win/lose system or

because they dislike that system altogether. Many committed teachers do not publish, either, except under pressure. I think this may be because a person who is a brilliant teacher with actual human beings in class may not feel ready to take the contents of that discussion, which were generated collectively in a particular context, and generalize them for the world at large in print, to see them reified in a journal which tends to deaden and to decontextualize whatever was said and to cast one as a solo authority rather than a mediator of development processes. That many women hate to write for publication should come as no surprise. Publication misrepresents the skills we were most trained to develop.

We find, then, that university jobs and functions which correspond to the traditional work of the women's spheres and to the collaborative parts of the personality carry low status, low pay, and low prestige. These tasks, even when well done in teaching and community service, count for virtually nothing when it comes to tenure and promotion in a model university.

It is ironic that the highest pay at big universities goes to those spending the least time with the students who supply the money for their pay. The students and parents underwrite the education but are not the major beneficiaries of it. The students' lives are not the stuff of higher education; the financing of the university benefits those who have most power and their counterparts in the corporation, the military, and the government. To most senior professors, whose vision is like that of feudal bishops or lords, knowledge has little relation to the lives of the incoming serfs, or freshmen. The curriculum will teach these serfs how to do what their professors have done: to keep a class advantage by dissociating themselves from their real selves and by identifying with authority.

When tenure and promotion committees make their decision, teachers (mostly men) who have gotten into the higher echelons through extensive publication or for generating national reputations count for far more than teachers (many women) who have remained in the so-called lower spheres, teaching mixed groups of students, administering, counseling, or advising, and doing the emotional equivalent of taking care of the family. Freshman teaching and advising are analogous to the housework of the university: they are never done and require endless energy, very much like the maintenance and upkeep of households. When we see students who need to be helped through the university's red tape and through the fearsome obstacle courses which college life can pose for students, we take the time out to do the work necessary, aware at the same time that all these labors are likely to be given, at best, an "excellence in advising" award every several years.

I have said that the university can be seen as a microcosm of the value structures of our culture. Most admired are the isolated competitive holders of territory or property who are successful at winning. Least valued, though central to the functioning of the whole system, are those who perform laterally oriented caretaking. Each discipline, as well, can be seen as a microcosm in terms of its content, as a pyramid in which certain content counts for a great deal more than other content. For example, within Economics, the study of paid work and of economic elements which can be quantified is legitimate and prestigious; the study of unpaid work, and of those lateral elements of the economy which cannot be quantified and which are blurred by the fact that records are not kept, has neither legitimacy nor prestige. Hence we are universally plagued with the grotesque fact that Economics has defined most of the work of the world right out of existence, training us by its microcosmic pyramidal paradigm to see only that which takes place in the public spheres and in the competitive world as "work." All the work of the pyramidal base, which is most of the work of the world, is

not even called work. Men and women everywhere misuse the word "work" because of the universal acceptance of this pyramidal and exclusive paradigm.

Likewise, Political Science teaches us to think that only those sections of political life which involve competition, territoriality, and distinct winning versus losing should be called "politics." It is denied that the rest of the pyramid is engaged in politics at all, even though we know that political structures affect everyone, and that the family, the Dean of Students' office, and the world of the students themselves are thoroughly colored by problems of power. We are trained to use the word "politics," like the word "work," to exclude most people and most parts of the personality. I would say that the more private life of the university is defined out of existence by the language we are taught. All of those whose value systems or functions have to do with the decent running of the university community rather than with competing, winning, or losing are defined right out of existence. They are assumed not to "know" anything and not to have anything to teach the others.

The study of literature usually involves a very few geniuses, and professors love to build pyramids and set one poet or tragedian on top of a pyramid and say that he is one of the great writers, or that a work is the greatest of its genre. Most uses of the written word, by people who did not compete for fame or notoriety or were not "geniuses," are ignored. To be ordinary is a sin, in the world of most literature teachers. The uses of language that have served to tie people together, such as the letter and the autobiography and the memoir, are considered beneath notice by most English professors. Only those works which distance themselves from an audience, by setting themselves up in a genre separate from the reader and requiring no answer from the reader, are considered to be "literary."

Likewise, in freshman English, we teach rhetoric, which as I have written elsewhere, is based on Greek models of persuasion, in which one leader persuades a group of followers of his point of view. But the great verbal medium of the lower part of the pyramid is conversation, that use of language which involves context, and give and take, and entertains diverse points of view. We give no training in conversation in our freshman English classes, nor do we evaluate it as a linguistic skill in our students, even though it is one which they will use far more than the skill of rhetoric (winning) in their day-by-day lives.

In general, attachment to the lateral, unremarkable day-by-day life characterizes the lower half of the pyramid, whereas attachment to vertically competitive, specialized and highly fragmented and nonrepresentative life characterizes the top half of the pyramid. As I have already suggested, the value systems of the two levels correspond to gender value systems as well. The metaphors of the top part of the pyramid reinforce the value system which men are trained with: You win or you lose, and those are the two alternatives in the game of life. Women are trained—subliminally, if not consciously—to work for the decent survival of all and to hold the social fabric together without making trouble. Women are not taught to make sure that one child in a family wins and that the others all lose. An academy focused in its values and its curriculum on the tops of the pyramids is bad for our self-esteem, in that it conveys the impression that we do not exist at all, unless we become like the visible males which it features.

I want now to talk about what happens to women when we "move up" in the pyramids I have sketched out. We are admired by men when we get into what has been previously or recently all-male territory. We are grudgingly admired by some and actually admired by others, but in general we are liked more if we enter into the male territory "clean,"

on its terms, than if we bring with us any of the value structures of caretaking, maintenance, and family work and/or advocate that the men learn from us about the skills involved in these. It is almost all right to be a woman climbing up in one of the academic departments and becoming famous. It is not all right to be dragging with you, as you go up, the sense that the university should care about students' lives and teach women's history.

Many women entering university structures and making their way up the existing ladders have been all too glad to do so and are not recognizable from their male counterparts. Most of us have internalized the values of the win/lose world, and our personalities are microcosms of it. Others among us insist on trying to change the structures we enter. This poses a threat to our job security in the university. I have been searching for a reason why some insist on bringing with us the materials that are clearly unwelcome on pyramid tops. It is for our survival as whole people, and for the creation of a world in which we can survive. We have refused to place on ourselves the low valuation that we were trained to accept. We have kept seeing ourselves not only as the "have-nots" but also as the "haves," with positive skills and secrets to teach the dominant world. This is the vision by which we hope to survive.

Seeing ourselves as the "haves" requires tremendous honesty and fortitude. Teaching Women's Studies or Minority Studies courses can be an aid in sustaining the vision and spreading it. At their best, such courses reflect the most positive ideals of the women's movement and the civil rights movement. Let me explain what I mean by this. I have said that out of sight on the laterally-grained bases of the pyramidal mountains are the work of everyday life and the functions of most of our personality. To teach Women's Studies or Black Studies is in part to bring the knowledge from the "lower" slopes into the "higher" parts of the pyramid, to validate the work of making and mending the social fabric. It is an attempt to make the so-called lower-caste functions seem real to everyone—not only real but essential for our survival as persons and as a race. When we create respect for the least common denominators of human life, we create respect for the invisible values we were taught to hold and to develop.

It is risky, because when we bring materials from the "lower" layers into the "higher" peaks, we are seen as lowering the standards, and when women bring our whole selves from those invisible positions into the content of higher education, we are usually seen to be positively anti-educational. We are accused of making the curriculum political, or making it soft, or narrowing it, or polemicizing it, or propagandizing on behalf of "small interest groups." As lower-caste people we are welcome in the higher structure only if we enter as atypical "ambitious" individuals, if we conform to the rules set down already within the upper structures. But if we bring the lower functions into the protected territories of the few, then we are seen as the public enemy, as the revolutionary threat. The way it is put to Women's Studies teachers usually is that we are weakening the search for excellence, for truth.

We are welcome in the system, then, if we don't bring with us the women's heritage, or if we don't try to teach Women's Studies. Now I want to see how this is reflected in women teachers' individual psyches, when we try to move women "up" after all these years of training in thinking that women were, and must be, "down." Internalized voices come from the competitive inner mentor who says, "Do it on their terms. You want to succeed, don't you? Don't try to change the structure of department meetings. Don't spend so much time with students. Don't teach that interdisciplinary stuff. You don't know enough. Team teaching is soft. Don't be a student advisor next term. It won't get you anywhere in the system. Go away. Stop talking to people. Make a major breakthrough in research and write it down and publish it. Get your name on

some articles. And don't do Women's Studies. It's contaminated, and will contaminate you."

While we have strong internalized "pinnacle" voices in us saying these things, at the same time other inner voices from our old lateral conditioning are saying that we have to do Women's Studies or Minority Studies, for only in trying to change the structures we enter, will we make visible our own personal core and the core of most of the world's reality. One set of voices tells us to engage in publication, competition, territoriality, abstraction, fragmentation, and isolation, in order to be a "winner" in the dominant system. The other set of voices tells us to take care of people both intellectually and emotionally, to create networks, friends, teams, nonjudgmental environments, nongraded courses, classrooms free from obvious fears, and consortia among many elements of the college community. This set of voices tells us this is the way to the decent survival of all, including ourselves.

I think that the second set of voices is saying the things which are particularly valid for us today and represent that side of all human personalities which we must learn to develop in all people in a nuclear age. Therefore I must now turn back to the imagery of pyramidal organization which I drew at the start and say that it is based on a faulty metaphor. It places at the "top" values and functions which for me are not morally and ethically and epistemologically at the top. I want to seek a new imagery that will allow us to resee the human functions in a way that validates what was previously lower-caste work and life and perception. I have proposed that women are the "haves," not the "have-nots," and that within the academy we have gravitated for our own reasons, as well as because of coercion, toward teaching, advising, conversation, caretaking, and collaboration because these are the most constructive human activities in the academy at present. I consider it a blessing that in lower-caste functions we were not assigned to play games of winning and losing all the time. We women were given the more constructive of the two assignments, and in a nuclear age the only safe role assignment is the one which was taught to us rather than to our brothers.

If one takes this revised view of the women as the haves one can mentally demote those on top of the pyramid and promote us. One can say the work done on the "top" has been ridiculous; it endangers us all, so we demote it. The problem is that those on top have the guns. They are now threatening us all. We can make the case for our superior moral status but the fact is that a few men have the money and power and prestige to act on their convictions that most people in the world, including all women, don't count. Therefore, the revised view that women are the "haves" on top of the pyramids, though it may be as accurate in an ethical or epistemological sense as the first view that women are the "have-nots," is also inaccurate as a full view, for we cannot simply wish ourselves to the tops of the pyramids of power.

How then do we get the full picture of where we are? My grandmother had a machine for seeing, called a stereopticon, which I would like to duplicate here as an intellectual tool. I am not talking about stereoscopic glasses which you can wear at a stereoscopic movie, though they work on somewhat the same principle. I'm also not quite talking about the Viewmaster in which the 3D slides of tropical fish or beautiful sights of Paris go by as you push the button. I'm talking about a nineteenth-century parlor stereopticon whose operation was very easy to see. You took a stiff card with two slightly different side-by-side photos printed on it and looked at it through an eyepiece which allowed your left eye only to look at the lefthand photo and your right eye only to look at the righthand one. Though your two eyes were seeing different pictures, miraculously the brain put them together to form a three-dimensional picture. It seems to me that if our teaching and our work for women embody this three-dimensional vision of ourselves

as both the haves and the have-nots, which is the accurate picture, we may be able to change the university, the individual personality, and the policies and values of the culture at large. And unless women can sustain the stereoscopic vision, our advances into highly paid positions will not benefit the world at all.

When you take this stereoptical machine and look at the academy and the culture it reflects, to see them three-dimensionally, the pyramids which seemed to dominate everything with relentless superiority and power take on a new aspect. I see them turning into big and even impressive mountains in a much larger geography. And I see that the mountains' summits are above timberline, are rocky, and tend to have a lot of snow and no vegetation. Down below the summits I see the part of the world that can support some life, where the winds are not so fierce, and plants and a few animals can grow. Below the lowest slopes of the mountains come the valleys which really do support abundant life. And then I feel I do have a picture of the pros and cons of being located in various places in this three-dimensional geography. It is good to get above timberline. It can be really wonderful; you get great views from there and you can make maps from the mountain tops. But the human race can't live on maps. Those professors on the summits are map-making, and taking pictures. But all their parkas and all their freeze-dried foods come from the valleys, which they are training others to overlook and are overlooking themselves. And most of them are half-crazy from lack of oxygen. We can laugh, because not every theoretician who is half-crazy from lack of oxygen is dangerous to us, but when a person incapable of practical life like George Gilder sits on his own little pinnacle and writes works which Ronald Reagan calls works of "Protean intellect," when these people removed from human life at the practical valley level start making public policies for us all, that's when it gets dangerous. Think-tank experts do their mathematical calculations about bombs and forget that human life depends on our getting beyond winning and losing, for the decent survival of all. Their traditional pinnacle educations set them up to do this, and our traditional pinnacle educations set us up to let them do it.

In this revised view of universities as some of the mountains on the globe's surface, we see that the universities do not really sustain life for us. It is great to go on those expeditions to the high peaks, but let's realize that those trips are luxuries of civilization. These are not the basis of civilization itself. History books written about the laws and wars as seen from the top down are not about the basis of our civilization. They are about those who had public power, but that is not all human history. Work in social theory which is divorced from the life in the valley, the lived life which people like Robert Coles are interested in, is also a luxury of civilization. It is not work on the human race, nor is it work for the human race.

I would say that not every bit of abstraction conceived on the mountains is founded on a clear view. Often, it is true, the view is clearer from up there, though generally it only seems so because life for mountaineers is less distracted, less interrupted, than life in the valleys below. But in fact, the weather in the valleys is usually clearer than the weather on the mountain tops. Pinnacle-climbing has attracted many people who, in the name of success, accomplishment, greatness, and achievement, are scrambling all over each other to be first, nationally or globally. For some of us who are not so keen, it is also important to climb those mountains in order to change the behavior of the warriors brandishing their missiles from the tops. For some of us there is also an incentive to climb the peaks or cross some of those mountain streams in order to find out whether there are resources in us that we did not realize we had. But all that risk-taking and all that aspiring toward summits was learned behavior which came to us from an elitist society, and I think the important word for the future should be not "up" but "down"--down into the valleys, down into the parts of our personalities we

were trained not to name or honor, down into the societal functions we were trained to take for granted and to disparage.

Now I want to end, making good on the promise to try to be utopian, and to imagine an academy not only re-seen but also re-done. I would like a valley-centered academy. I would like a valley-centered academy studying the largest possible diverse samples of reality, rather than assuming that large numbers of diverse human beings or phenomena mess up the sample. I would like academies which also create a lateral kind of structure in the psyche of the human being—not pyramidal, not always saying, "I've got to be up, better, aspiring, growing, learning, achieving, winning, making something of myself, upwardly mobile." I would like the kind of academy which gives students the ability to see themselves as, let's say, rooted trees, not motionless, but fairly stable, and having recognizable trunks and branches; clearly different from all other trees; not scrambling to get up some mountain; rooted rather well, perhaps serving as a good windbreak for others in the valley. This Indiana countryside where your GLCA conference meets is wonderful for imagery of windbreaks.

I want to run through some of the pieces of the patchwork quilt which in my mind would constitute the changed academy. And I want to thank Joyce Parr and Rita Kipp for their wonderful imagery connected with the making of quilts, which has come out of this GLCA Women's Studies context. The image of the patchwork quilt really serves me here because I can't say which of these elements is most important. Nor do I think it is healthy that we are always taught to rank in pyramids our priorities, our goals, our aspirations, and our aims. Here is the social fabric of the university I would like to see. I would like to have an education and a culture which makes it possible for me to be friends with Black women and with the voices of Black women in my own psyche. I would also like an education which gives me tools to see and to do something about caste structures, not only the awareness that they exist, but the political canniness to do something to change them and to influence the public policies of our culture. I'd like an education which provides all students with stereoscopical vision of all mountains, including the ones replicated in their own personalities, so that they know those "great" professors, or stars, or economists, or presidents up there on the "summits" don't necessarily do or know as much as we have been told, and they know also the richness and the necessity of valley life. On the practical level, I agree with Adrienne Rich: I would like universities and academies which are open at all hours to all people and which have arrangements for the caretaking of young children. And if you think this doesn't fit into my list, it is only that we have been taught that the abstract really doesn't belong with the daily, and I think the changed university will work against that misconception.

I would like a university in which everybody teaches. That is, everybody spends some part of each day in teaching someone, as well as in being taught. Logistically, it's complex. Practically, it represents what the university needs to be—a place in which the division between authority figures and learners is blurred and the relationship is made more lateral. All of us at some level can be teachers if we make the university community wide enough and include enough young people and old people. I would like a university which resembles this conference in having interrelationships between students and faculty and administrators. I consider this conference as a model also in that this is a place in which women are not ashamed of being women and don't feel they need to compete in previously male territory.

I would like to have a university curriculum which creates in all of our students the ability to see systemically, to see not only in terms of individuals who are "achievers," or "accomplishers," but to see also that all of us in the spheres we were assigned do

valid work. As you know, I would like a university that alerts students to the fact that "work" as presently used is a white-male-defined word having to do with participation in the public paid labor force. As you also know, I would like a curriculum that alerts all of our students to the fact that the word "politics" as it is now used carries a white male bias in referring only to paid public politics in the most visible spheres. Power structures are everywhere. Work is everywhere. All women work. I would like a university curriculum that makes students so alert to this kind of fact they they really do become transformers of the institutions they enter.

As you can see, I want a revised college or university which trains all students to trust, develop, and use the devalued parts of the personality associated with human upkeep, maintenance, and caretaking. I want a university to train women to enter, if they wish, into the territories which used to be male territories, but to take with them the values of the "women's spheres," and to see these as the values both of the "haves" and of the "have-nots." I think it is not so important for us to get women's bodies in high places because that doesn't necessarily help at all in social change. But to promote women who carry a new consciousness of how the mountain strongholds of white men need valley values—this will change society. Social change can be produced by any group of persons who are revalidating the layers of work and personality that we were taught didn't count. Such persons placed high up in existing power structures can really make a difference.

I would like all white men and other privileged students who attend our institutions to come out working for a better balance in their personalities and their world. If they do so, they will reconceive affirmative action, not as a program to benefit the have-nots but as a program to benefit the dominant structure by making it more balanced or inclusive. They will learn to learn from those they were taught to disparage.

Any academy which transforms students' minds in this way will have been thoroughly transformed by Women's Studies. We need women in the curriculum because all of our knowledge, especially about so-called civilization, is inaccurate without them. Knowledge of how to make the human race survive is the essential knowledge which the study of all lower-caste functions, in the personality and in society, brings into the curriculum.

I want to end now by describing the mood or atmosphere I would expect to see in the revised university or personality structure. There is a wonderful public radio news program now called "All Things Considered." What it did for radio news is what I trust the changed academy could do within the academic world. Consider radio news before "All Things Considered." The news was a desiccated, rapid-fire recital of mostly depressing events having to do with three or four types of information, chiefly violence or winning and losing of one sort or another. The news was disconnected. There was a hyped-up tone of delivery that implied that each story was "hot," but you heard so little of each story that you really weren't sure at the end of the newscast what you had heard. The news was right in line with the main values of our culture. It stressed competitiveness, violence, and fragmentation, and it featured a few stars or a few cataclysmic events which destroyed life, happiness, and property. The news was very inexpertly produced; the programs didn't really make good use of available radio technology. They were filled with a kind of fake energy and were based on a very limited idea of what news is and what human life is. It was assumed that violence was a prime necessity of life. And you and I were in the news only as exceptions, not as the norm. Basically, we were a problem to the news because there was no news in what we did, according to the rigid crisis-centered formulae of the newscasters.

"All Things Considered" came along—bringing a breath of fresh air, in the voices of those people doing the interviews, and in its whole texture and tone. First of all, the programs were long. Then they were discursive. And they were informal. Susan Stamberg did not ask people formulaic questions in order to get a few tiny encapsulated answers. She seemed to ask for curiosity's sake about the lives of those she interviewed. And she took great pleasure, and takes great pleasure to this day, in hearing their answers. You hear her chuckling on the radio, and when she chuckles, you know she's not putting it on; she didn't go through a broadcasters' course to learn how to chuckle. Blowing through that program is a new breath of educational and imaginative air. The program says there are many valid ways of being human. It is truly democratic in its scope. I'm sure its staff feels it hasn't arrived, hasn't yet fulfilled the democratic promises it suggests. I am sure it is aware of the many people it doesn't cover. But the aim is there; the energy is there; and moreover, it has been a tremendous public success. People like—are interested in—the show. Their curiosity is piqued by "All Things Considered." People become fond of the human beings doing the program. It's not a bunch of nameless voices giving you bad news in rapid-fire fragments. It really validates life in the continuum of the valleys, and life in the peaceful parts of our personalities.

Now, if they did it for public radio, can't we do it at at least a few colleges? I would like to leave you with this hope—that a few colleges within the next decades, if we live that long, will try to do for the academy what "All Things Considered" has done for radio news, starting from the overlooked invisible sectors in ourselves and in society. Such a transformation does not entail letting go all the facts and skills we learned in those competitive and fragmented territorial curricula and structures, but trying to use what we learned from those educations to bring a new balance to all life and personality. We need to try to bring the real breath of human life and fallibility and humor into the daily work of the university and to lessen the component of fear, the component of competitiveness, and the component of disdain for most of life.

I want our colleges to produce feminist thought and behavior in women and men. I suppose I should say, since I have made that plain statement, what I mean by "feminism." It doesn't chiefly have to do with careerism or jobs for women. That's too narrow a focus on women as the have-nots. It doesn't chiefly have to do with rights for women. That is also too narrow a focus on women as the have-nots. Nor does it chiefly have to do with creating women's communities. That is too narrowly focused on women as the haves. My view of feminism is that it is a movement of body, soul, mind, and heart aimed at getting the materials of the traditional lower-caste work of caretaking into dominant places in our psyches, dominant places in our curriculum, dominant places in our universities, our government, our military, and our corporate worlds, with the aim of rescuing the human race from its present dangerous position. The dangerous position grew out of that tendency of all the institutions and our private psyches to buy a model of life which carried this proposition: "Either you win or you lose. You kill or you are killed." The value system from the traditional women's functions in society has been the value system of helping to keep the human race alive, and I imagine that it is clear to everybody in this room what a very top priority that now needs to be for all of us.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE WOMAN SCIENTIST

Laurel Sherman, Oberlin, Ohio

In Europe and in America there has been an evolution in the roles that women have found to play in the scientific community. While they were amateurs first, working alone and self-educated for the most part, there developed in the nineteenth century a group we might call semi-professionals. New job opportunities produced scientific women who were text-book writers, teachers, museum workers, astronomical clerks and calculators, collectors, illustrators, laboratory workers, and translators of scientific texts. Towards the end of the last century the fully educated, professional woman scientist evolved, a type whose development has continued to the present.

Among the most important reasons for the changes that occurred is the rapid professionalization of science in the nineteenth century, accompanied by increasing scientific organization. It is no coincidence that the Royal Institution was founded in 1800, the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1830, the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the 1850's, and that the London Royal Society was reformed in 1850. In addition, sciences were organizing by discipline. Women were sometimes asked to join these groups. An example of this can be found in a speech that Edward B. Tylor, the Oxford anthropologist, delivered to the Anthropological Society of Washington in 1884:

> And one thing I particularly noticed was this, that to get at the confidence of the tribe, the man of the house, though he can do a great deal, cannot do it all. If his wife sympathizes with his work and is able to do it, really half of the work of investigation seems to fall to her, so much is to be learned through the women of the tribe which the men will not readily disclose. The experience seemed to me a lesson to anthropologists not to . . . warn the ladies off from their proceedings, but rather to avail themselves thankfully of their help.[1]

The other major change which advanced women's opportunities was the availability of secondary and university education. From the early secondary schools and female seminaries of the 1820's to the opening of the big universities after the Civil War, the century was one of expanding opportunity. In America, co-education was available from the opening of Oberlin in 1833. Opportunities for women in England lagged behind somewhat. It wasn't until Queen's College opened in London that women could participate in the same university experiences as their brothers. The finest universities were to hold out the longest. Oxford offered degrees to women only in 1920, while Cambridge waited one more war, granting its first degrees to women only in 1948.

A further point, made in Margaret Rossiter's new book, Women Scientists in America, is that not only did the possibility for secondary education make the difference in employment for women, but the opening of graduate departments in the 1890's made it possible for women to become fully professional scientists.

---

1. Nancy O. Lurie, "Women in Early American Anthropology," in Pioneers of American Anthropology, the Uses of Biography, ed. by June Helm (Seattle: University Press, 1966), p. 34.

While it would be naive to think that this education was an instant entree into scientific work, it was the crack in the door. It raised women's competence and their expectations. In 1820 women were writing popular scientific text-books that they declared were intended only for other women; by 1920 they were writing scientific texts intended for the technical market.

One way to see the evolution of roles in science is to look at the lives and careers of a few women scientists who exemplify the stages in the development.

I. The Amateurs

To look at the first group, the amateurs, requires a clarification of the word "amateur." Some women were amateurs in the sense that they had no scientific training. They were self-taught or taught by a male colleague, friend, or relative. Some women were also amateurs in that what they did was done for pleasure and they received no remuneration for it. There were many men in science who were also amateurs in this sense, as it was only in the nineteenth century that science became adequately professionalized to provide employment for many. However, women lagged behind, frequently being employed only in areas in which it was hard to find men willing to do the work.

Many amateurs found a congenial atmosphere in Victorian England. There, the fad for the study of natural history was a long-lasting one, and one which affected many women. These women were encouraged in their interest in the natural world. They became collectors of specimens, illustrators of botanical texts, and writers of books. The pursuit of botany by young ladies was considered universally suitable. The American Maria Edgeworth wrote in her Letters for Literary Ladies:

> It is not a science of parade, it affords occupation and infinite variety, it demands no bodily strength, it can be pursued in retirement; there is no danger of its inflaming the imagination, because the mind is intent upon realities. . . . Botany has become fashionable; in time it may become useful.[2]

Marianne North (1830-1890) is a good example of an amateur botanist who made significant contributions to science by her work. She describes her own training:

> In London during 1850 I had some lessons in flower-painting from a Dutch lady, Miss van Fowinkel, from whom I got the few ideas I possess of arrangement of colour and of grouping, and then we recommenced the happy old life at Rogham, I passing the hours and hours of every day on horseback, painting and singing with little fear of interruption. . . . On the 17th of January 1855 my mother died. Her end had come gradually; for many weeks we felt it was coming. She did not suffer, but enjoyed nothing and her life was a dreary one. She made me promise never to leave my father.[3]

In what was a typical fate for women in this era, care of an elderly relative took priority over any plans she might have had for making a life for herself. She continues, after her father's death:

---

2. Maria Edgeworth, Letters for Literary Ladies, to which is added an essay on the science of self-justification, (George Town: Joseph Milligan, 1810), pp. 39-40.
3. Marianne North, Vision of Eden, The Life and Work of Marianne North (Webb & Bower: Exeter, England, 1980), p. 18.

> He never woke again, and left me indeed alone. For nearly forty years he had been my one friend and companion, and now I had to learn to live without him and to fill up my life with other interests as I best might. . . . I went straight to Mentone to devote myself to painting from nature, and try to learn from the lovely world which surrounded me there how to make that work henceforth the master of my life.[4]

Her painting took her around the world, touching at one time or another almost every continent. Her hundreds of paintings can be seen in the Marianne North Gallery at Kew Gardens in London. She discovered new species that were named for her. That she was able to accomplish so much, starting relatively late in life, and traveling throughout the world alone, is nothing short of amazing.

A similar woman, Mary Kingsley (1862-1900), became a collector of fish for the British Museum and wrote about life among the tribes of West Africa at a time when the steamship lines refused to issue return tickets to this dark side of the continent. Like Marianne North's, her early life was also sheltered by her parents, and constrained by their care. After their death she undertook the care of her brother. Only when he took a trip to China did she do anything on her own: "It was in 1893 that, for the first time in my life, I found myself in possession of five or six months which were not heavily forestalled, and feeling like a boy with a new half-crown, I lay about in my mind . . . as to what to do with them."[5]

She reported on her travels in two books, Travels in West Africa and West African Studies. In addition, she became a sought-after speaker on her return to England. She is remembered for her wit and for her ability to understand the native. She urged acceptance of native ways and a minimizing of European influence in West Africa. The same Dr. Tylor whom we quoted above said of her:

> It seems to me that some of Mary Kingsley's readers may have been led astray by her light chaffy style into calling her superficial. But getting information from white and black by such easy talk was the method she found to answer wonderfully well. There can be no doubt she was extraordinarily successful in finding by this familiar way how matters of life appear to the African mind. During the few years I had the privilege of her friendship, I came to appreciate her power of getting to the back of the negro mind. In her own peculiar way she will hardly be replaced. I am glad that Mary Kingsley's genius and sympathy with the barbarian mind is having justice done to it.[6]

Although this was written at the turn of the century and reflects attitudes that today might not appear enlightened, it must be remembered that at the time Mary Kingsley was extolling the virtue of primitive peoples, many Europeans believed them to be only barely human.

Equally glowing in his description of her work was Dr. Gunther of the British Museum:

> She had an extraordinary gift of observation and she noted a number of facts of life of animals of which only a small proportion are recorded in

---

4. Ibid., p. 26.
5. Ibid., p. 26.
6. Mary H. Kingsley, Travels in West Africa (London: Macmillan and Co.,1897), p. 1.

> her public writings. She consulted me as to the branch of zoology in which she could collect with some prospect of gaining useful results. We finally decided she should devote her attention to the fishes of the rivers and lakes visited by her. Collecting fishes in spirits is always a laborious and somewhat expensive task, requiring much care and patience. Yet inspite of the slenderness of her means and outfit she succeeded in bringing home a good collection of admirably preserved specimens, a fair proportion being new to science, and all valuable to our museum. Her success was entirely due to her judicious selection of the specimens and to her energy, which overcame all obstacles and which was characteristic of her.[7]

Not all the amateurs were to be found in natural history. Agnes Pockels (1862-1935) became known for her work on surface tension, work that was done entirely with home-fashioned equipment. The instrument that she devised for measuring surface tension is the model for tensiometers still in use today. Her work was ultimately published in the British Nature because it came to the attention of Lord Rayleigh, who submitted it to the journal. In her native Germany she was ignored until years after her most important work had been done. She writes of her education:

> . . .at that time women had no right to higher studies. And even when the very first beginnings of higher education for girls came along my parents discouraged me from doing it. For this reason I do not carry a doctor's title. Therefore I had to educate myself in an auto-didactic fashion, . . . through books that my brother got for me in Gottingen. I didn't get very far in the mathematical treatment of physics in this way; and so I only understand to my great sorrow the theoretical side of this field. . . . That my works have been used by others as the basis for new and additional investigation is a great consolation.[8]

II. The Semi-Professionals

The emergence of semi-professional positions for women in science began before higher education was at all wide-spread. Some women, even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, found work as illustrators for scientific texts and botanical books. By the nineteenth century, however, women could be found in many areas.

We might focus on perhaps the most successful of these, Mary Somerville (1780-1872). The daughter of a naval man, she grew up in Scotland, almost completely uneducated. Her father was shocked to learn that by the time she was nine she still could not read. She was promptly sent to Miss Primrose's school, where she learned embroidery and longed to be at home again. By the time she was old enough to marry she had had lessons in painting, foreign languages, dancing, needlework, and music. But what she longed to learn was mathematics. When she was caught studying a book she had persuaded her brother's tutor to give her, her candles were taken away. After that she memorized passages from the book and repeated them to herself in the dark at night.

She may have viewed her marriage to Samuel Grieg, another British officer, as a release from home life. However, she wrote of this first marriage:

---

7. Alice Stopford Green, "Mary Kingsley," Journal of the African Society, I (October 1901), 10.
8. Agnes Pockels, "Die Arbeiten von Agnes Pockels uber Grenzschichten and Filme," Kolloid-Zeitschrift, 58 (Jan. 1932), 3.

> My husband had taken me to his bachelor's house in London. . . . I was alone the whole of the day, so I continued my mathematical and other pursuits, but under great dis-advantages; for although my husband did not prevent me from studying, I met with no sympathy whatever from him, as he had a very low opinion of the capacity of my sex, and had neither knowledge of nor interest in science of any kind.[9]

When her husband died after only three years, she found that she was truly free to study as she pleased:

> I was thirty-three years of age when I bought this excellent little library. I could hardly believe that I possessed such a treasure. . . . I now had the means, and pursued my studies with increased assiduity; concealment was no longer possible, nor was it attempted. I was considered eccentric and foolish, and my conduct was highly disapproved of by my family. They expected me to entertain and keep a gay house for them, and in that they were disappointed. As I was quite independent, I did not care for their criticism.[10]

Her subsequent marriage to Dr. Somerville provided her with an entree into scientific society. Her life changed to one of study and writing. Her first book was a translation and interpretation of LaPlace's Mechanique Celeste. Her ability to make this work comprehensible to the ordinary reader was widely praised, and it made her reputation for scientific writing. The ultimate acceptance of the book was given when it was used as a text for the mathematics Tripos at Cambridge. Other books followed and were equally successful. The Connexion of the Physical Sciences went through many English and American editions.

Others also found work as textbook writers. Jane Marcet (1769-1858) became well-known for her chemistry text, Conversations on Chemistry. Her reason for writing the text and for its particular format, namely a conversation between two children and their friend, Mrs. B., can be found in the Preface:

> In venturing to offer to the public, and more particularly to the female sex, an Introduction to Chemistry, the Author, herself a woman, conceives that some explanation may be required; . . . On attending for the first time, experimental lectures, the Author found it almost impossible to derive any clear or satisfactory information from the rapid demonstrations which are usually . . . crowded into popular courses. . . . But frequent opportunities having afterwards occurred of conversing with a friend on the subject of chemistry, and of repeating a variety of experiments, she became better acquainted with the principles of that science. . . . Hence it was natural to infer, that familiar conversation was, in studies of this kind, a most useful auxiliary source of information; and more especially to the female sex, whose education is seldom calculated to prepare their minds for abstract ideas, or scientific language.[11]

---

9. Mary Somerville, Personal Recollections From Early Life to Old Age of Mary Somerville with Selections from her Correspondence, ed. by Martha Somerville (London: John Murray, 1873), p. 75.
10. Ibid., p. 80.
11. Jane Marcet, Conversations on Chemistry (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Green, & Longman, 1832), pp. A3-4.

This volume became an enormous success, running to sixteen English editions, and selling more than 160,000 copies in the United States. Michael Faraday, director of the Royal Institution, credited it with his own introduction to chemistry.

The women who wrote texts, however, represent only a small number of the women who found jobs as semi-professional scientists. To their ranks we can add the illustrators. Maria Sibylla Merian (1647-1717) was one of the earliest. Her book on the metamorphosis of caterpillars was based on work she did in Surinam, where she journeyed with her young daughter in 1704. It is remembered for the accuracy of her depiction of the plants on which metamorphosing caterpillars feed, and for the accuracy of her description of the insects themselves.

Some of the more intrepid early women scientists were the collectors. They earned their living by selling specimens to the many collectors and museums of the nineteenth century which were caught up in the fad for things natural. Mary Anning (1799-1847) was only a young girl when her father died and she took over his fossil collecting. She soon left the small items that he had been collecting to sell to tourists, however, and began to dig out dinosaurs. By the time she died she had an international reputation as one of the finest collectors and scholars in dinosaur fossils. Amalie Dietrich was a collector of living plants and animals who made her reputation in Australia and New Zealand towards the end of the nineteenth century. She was completely self-educated and took up collecting to support herself and her daughter. She described her work in Australia in the 1880's in a letter to her daughter in Germany:

> In every province something new and unknown presents itself. And all those wonders of nature, whether they be humble mosses, slugs, spiders and centipedes, or the implements, skulls, and skeletons of the aborigines, —one and all serve to bind me to the old homeland. Thus, backwards and forwards, invisible threads are drawn across the sea, linking myself and all the scholars who go to work on what I send. Through them I shall gain recognition.[12]

Of course many women found themselves teaching science and mathematics, and many were encouraged in this by people like Louis Agassiz and his summer laboratory school at Penikese Island. Although this flourished for only two years, so many men and women attended it, later becoming influential teachers, that it is remembered as a forerunner of modern, coeducational summer laboratory schools.

Museums were another place of employment. The California Academy of Sciences, which was responsible for the careers of several noted women botanists, noted on August 1, 1853: "Be it resolved that we highly approve the aid of females in every department of natural history, and that we earnestly invite their cooperation."

Alice Eastwood, the California botanist, worked at the California Academy Museum and was there during the San Francisco earthquake when she managed to save only her hand-lens and a few boxes of specimens from the fires that followed the quake. Another museum worker was Mary Jane Rathbun (1860-1943), who worked at the Smithsonian and was the one to name the Chesapeake Bay blue crab Callinectes sapidus, which means "beautiful swimmers."

---

12. Charitas Dietrich Bischoff, The Hard Road: The Life Story of Amalie Dietrich, Naturalist, 1821-1891 (London: Martin Hopkinson, 1931).

In the United States an area which attracted many women was the work of astronomical clerks. They were responsible for reading star photographs and recording the positions of stars. They often compiled catalogues of the stars and generally did the work too tedious for young men. But many of them advanced from this clerical work to become first rate astronomers. Williamina Flemming even advanced from housekeeper to protege of Edward Pickering of the Harvard University Observatory, who is reported to have said that his housekeeper could do better than the men who were working for him at the time. He brought her in, and eventually Mrs. Flemming became the curator of astronomical photographs. She is remembered for her classification of the stars based on the spectra that they emit.

Finally there was a group of women who were famous as interpreters of science. Madame du Chatelet (1706-1749), mistress of Voltaire, wrote the first French version of Newton's Principia, having translated and interpreted it from the Latin. Clemence Royer (1830-1902) was famous for her translation and notes on Darwin's Origin of Species. With her long introduction she managed to double that already lengthy work. In her introduction she criticizes Darwin for skirting the issue of the evolution of man. He writes of her in a letter to Joseph Hooker: "I must enjoy myself and tell you about Mlle. Royer, who translated the 'Origin' into French. . . . Besides her enormously long preface to the first edition, she has added a second preface abusing me like a pickpocket."[13]

III. The Professionals

Eventually the availability of secondary and graduate education made it possible for women to enter research and academic positions as fully professional scientists. Although this movement started at the end of the last century, full equality for women in the sciences has yet to arrive. Many examples of early women professionals demonstrate that this equality did not follow immediately upon their completing their graduate education and finding work in research labs. Lise Meitner (1878-1968) was one of the first women to graduate in physics in Vienna, and she went almost immediately to Berlin to study with Planck. Although she intended to stay only a short time, she remained in Berlin, working with the young Otto Hahn until her Jewish heritage made it essential that she flee Germany in 1938. She worked with Hahn in the discovery of fission. Although the last experiments were done with Fritz Strassman after she had left Germany, it was she who provided the theoretical explanation for the experiment. Unfortunately, her contribution to this discovery was not recognized, and Otto Hahn was awarded the Nobel Prize for the discovery of nuclear fission. Meitner's biographer, Fritz Krafft, said of this:

> As long as he lived, Otto Hahn was reluctant to mention Lise Meitner in connection with the discovery of uranium fission, whereas Fritz Strassman, the co-discoverer, is convinced that Lise Meitner's part even up to the finding of the barium had already been so great that she must be ranked among the discoverers, not only because of the first correct theoretical interpretation.[14]

---

13. William Irvine, Apes, Angels, and Victorians (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), p. 188.
14. Fritz Krafft, "Lise Meitner: Her Life and Times — on the Centenary of the Great Scientist's Birth," Angewandte Chemie, International Edition in English, 17 (1978), 834.

Many other women could serve as examples of the fully educated, fully professional woman scientist of the twentieth century. The American Florence Sabin (1871-1953) was the first woman elected to the National Academy of Sciences. Her work on the lymphatics helped unravel their mysterious function. Marie Curie (1867-1934) is another example and belongs to the group of women scientists who worked with their husbands. Her case is unique, however, because it was he who gave up his own line of research in order to join hers. Although she was the first woman to receive a Nobel Prize and the only one so far to receive two, it was a disappointment to her that she was never elected a member of the French Academie. Kathleen Lonsdale (1903-1971) was one of the first two women elected members of the Royal Society in 1944. She managed to raise a family and continue her work on x-ray crystallography throughout her life. She maintained that the enforced change that child-bearing brought to a woman allowed her to move in different directions. Her career reflected her diverse interests and these enforced changes. Other women scientists, Dorothy Hodgkin for example, have suggested that Lonsdale would have been able to do more sustained work if she had not been at this womanly disadvantage. Dr. Hodgkin is quoted as saying, "I think she idealized the situation somewhat."[15]

By the 1950's the position of women in research labs had changed significantly from the beginnings in the first decades of this century. Women like Dorothy Hodgkin (1910-) have been able to go to the top of their labs with little opposition. This is not to say that there is no longer any opposition to a woman holding the director's chair, but it is to note that some women have made it. Dr. Hodgkin is another British crystallographer who used x-rays to describe the structure of penicillin and vitamin B 12, two very complex biological molecules. America's Rosalyn Yalow, who won the Nobel Prize for her work on the radioimmunoassay technique, is another woman who has been able to move smoothly to the top of her field. While she laments that there are not more women in science, she has also urged that women try to overcome their aversion to things technical.

Recent examples of unfair treatment are not hard to find. Rosalyn Franklin's contribution to the discovery of the structure of DNA is well documented now, but the ridicule that she received at the hands of James Watson in his Double Helix is hard to forget. Similarly, Jocelyn Bell Burnell, who discovered pulsars, is frequently cited as an example of a student whose supervisor took credit for her work. Her supervisor at Cambridge, Anthony Hewish, received the Nobel Prize for the discovery. It is interesting to note that she continues to insist that it is right that she did not share in the prize, although other noted astronomers (Fred Hoyle, for example) have said that the prize should have been shared.

We have seen enormous diversity in the lives of women scientists from various ages. Their stories are a testimony to the fact that women are capable of the finest scientific work, and that they are responsible for significant discoveries in every area.

---

15. Dorothy Crowfoot Hodgkin, "Kathleen Lonsdale," Biographical Memoirs of the Fellows of the Royal Society, 20, (1974), 473.

THE ARTIST AS HERO IN MAXINE HONG KINGSTON'S THE WOMAN WARRIOR

Warren Rosenberg, Wabash College

The standard works on the hero and the heroic, Campbell's Hero with a Thousand Faces, Norman's The Hero: Myth, Image, Symbol, and Lord Raglan's The Hero all assume a male hero, relegating "heroine" to a supporting diminutive. Carol Pearson and Katherine Pope in their recently published The Female Hero in American and British Literature (R.R. Bowker, 1981) offer a feminist definition of hero that should open the canon to new works and help us reevaluate traditional texts. Females are heroic in archetypal ways, the authors argue, if not in the narrowly conceived "macho" image of the violent, conquering male. Such an archetypal hero "masters the world by understanding it, not by dominating, controlling, or owning the world or other people." The obstacles the hero must overcome during the mythic quest, then, are "not so much physical as spiritual and psychological."[1] For the female hero the heroic quest takes the form of a:

> psychological journey in which the hero escapes from the captivity of her conditioning and searches for her true self. As in the classic version of the story, she descends into the underworld of her psyche to encounter the life-denying forces, or dragons, within. These are the forces of fragmentation, self-loathing, fear and paralysis. When she slays the dragons, she becomes, or is united with her true self.[2]

Finally, the authors transform Campbell's stages of the heroic journey to fit the female literary experience. "Departure" becomes "the exit from the garden," an escape from dependency; "Initiation" becomes a search for a male savior; and "Return" becomes "a woman is her mother," and "the new family," reconciliation with the mother and the establishment of new communal structures to replace old patriarchal ones.

Maxine Hong Kingston's The Woman Warrior, a challenging work in form and theme, is precisely the kind of text that can be appreciated more fully in light of Pearson and Pope's revisioning of the hero. Because it is part fiction and part essay, however, we must alter the way the mythic paradigm outlined above is applied. There are no characters, in a strictly literary sense, and no plot, if one defines plot as a fictitious narrative unfolding through time. But if we substitute the narrator/author for the character of the hero, and the juxtaposition of story, event, and first person reflection for traditional plot, the book can be seen as depicting a heroic journey, although the terms of heroism have been reshaped by Kingston. All of the stages—departure, initiation, and return—are present, but interrelated in the telling.

The first section of the book, "No Name Woman," chillingly establishes the primary obstacle the narrator will encounter on her quest, a misogynist cultural legacy. Years before her mother had come to America from China, the narrator's aunt, who had been ostracized for committing forced adultery, killed her newborn infant and herself. The response of the village was to forbid her being talked about or remembered. By not asking questions about her aunt (the "no name woman") for twenty years after hearing the story from her mother, the narrator feels she has participated in the punishment. (The significance of the fact that her mother had broken the prohibition never strikes

---

1. Carol Pearson and Katherine Pope, The Female Hero in American and British Literature (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1981), p.5.
2. Pearson and Pope, p.63.

the narrator.) Now, however, in writing about her, Kingston is partially atoning for guilt about that participation—exorcizing a ghost, as she puts it. In this sense, the aunt, through the mother's telling, can be seen as one initiator of the narrator's quest.

Yet in the second section of the book we learn that the same misogynist culture also provides an image of female heroism with which the author can positively identify. Again the conveyor is the author's mother, Brave Orchid (a figure who, as we will see, embodies the contradictory messages of misogyny and female heroism). I would like to concentrate on this section, "White Tigers," and the last in the book, "A Song for a Barbarian Reed Pipe," for they present the narrator's quest most explicitly, while the other two sections focus on Brave Orchid and are, therefore, aspects of the reconciliation with the mother stage.

Kingston writes in "White Tigers" that her mother said she "would grow up a wife and a slave, but she taught me the song of the warrior woman, Fa Mu Lan, the girl who took her father's place in battle."[3] In an extended fantasy section the narrator then imagines she is Fa Mu Lan. As a girl of seven she is called by a bird that looks like the ideograph for "human" to the mountains, where she is taken in by an old couple (images of the ideal parents) who offer to train her as a warrior if she stays with them for fifteen years. They teach her self-control, wisdom, and how to see the world correctly, that is poetically. "I learned to make my mind large, as the universe is large, so that there is room for paradoxes," she says (p.29). Heroism thus becomes a matter of enlarging and sharpening one's perceptions as well as one's physical capabilities. During the training female biology is not an issue: "menstrual days did not interrupt my training; I was as strong as on any other day." The old couple reassure her that she will win her battles because even if she fights against soldiers trained as she is, they will be men and, therefore, "heavy footed and rough." And her enemies would all be men, wealthy and powerful. Her training is over when she can point to the sky and make a sword appear, "a silver bolt in the sunlight, and control its slashing with her mind" (p.33). Although the woman warrior is a superb physical fighter, what separates her from her foes are her great mental powers.

When she returns home from training, her parents, who expected she would be chosen to avenge the wrongs they suffered, etch their words of revenge into her back. The narrator then puts on men's clothes and armor ("because the Chinese executed women who disguised themselves as soldiers or students, no matter how bravely they fought or how high they scored on examinations," p. 39), collects an army and goes to battle. What is of particular interest here, especially in light of Pearson and Pope's contention that the female hero does not merely become the traditional male hero, is how Kingston's warrior combines female and male attributes. Her army does not rape, and they bring order wherever they go. She even manages to have a baby in the midst of fighting. Having been married to her childhood sweetheart in absentia, she becomes pregnant on her return, but merely alters her armor during the last four months so that she looks like a "powerful, big man." She hides from battle only once, to actually bear the child. She and her husband, who had followed her to the battlefield, tie the dried umbilical cord to the battle flag staff and head back to the fighting:

> We made a sling for the baby inside my big armor, and rode back into the thickest part of the fighting. The umbilical cord flew with the real

---

3. Maxine Hong Kingston, The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1977), p.20. All subsequent references will be to this edition and will be noted in the text.

> flag and made us laugh. . . . I walked bowed, and the baby warmed himself against me, his heart beating like my heart (p.40).

When the baby is a month old she sends him and her husband home so she can finish her campaign. She alters her clothes, again becoming the thin man. "Only now," she says, "I would get so lonely with the tent so empty that I slept outside." In her final battle she encounters the baron most responsible for the murder and abductions in her village. She confronts him as a "female avenger," but he responds, not realizing he is facing a woman, with the sayings she hates: "Girls are maggots in the rice," and "It is more profitable to raise geese than daughters." After the woman warrior rips off her shirt to allow him to read the writing on her back, the narrator states, "When I saw his startled eyes at my breasts, I slashed him across the face and on the second stroke cut off his head" (p.44). At the end of this first half of "White Tigers" the woman warrior returns a hero to her village and family. Having avenged them and assured their future safety, she is now ready to assume more traditional female duties.

In the final section of "White Tigers" and in "A Song for the Barbarian Reed Pipe," Kingston tries to transfer the heroism of the woman warrior to her Chinese-American life. Without the aid of fantasy, it is quite a struggle. The fact that she is an "A" student in school and eventually goes to Berkeley is irrelevant to her family. She is still a girl—she couldn't change that with "A's." And the racist bosses she works for, analogous to the baron in her fantasy, laugh and fire her when she refuses to do anything she finds repugnant. It is almost hopeless; the internal and external dragons are too strong in reality: "To avenge my family I'd have to storm across China to take back our farm from the Communists," she says. "I'd have to rage across the United States to take back the laundry in New York and the one in California. Nobody in history conquered and united both North America and Asia" (p.49).

What we realize as we read The Woman Warrior, struggling ourselves to make sense out of the conflicting values and cultural messages, is that it is in the making of this book that Kingston achieves heroism in Pearson and Pope's sense of escaping from the captivity of conditioning and finding, or creating, her true self. The key weapon she uses, the source of her power, is language, and literature's capacity to order reality. The primary obstacle to be overcome in this quest, and, of course, also its initiator, is her mother. Kingston could not have written this book and achieved selfhood, had she not come to terms with her mother's complex and contradictory nature. Traditional anti-feminism and participation in mysterious Chinese rituals combine confusingly in her mother with a strong sense of self-pride, worldly success (an M.D. degree in China), and the habit of "talking story." But it is her mother's ambivalence that plays a central part in motivating Kingston's search for self, and her stories that provide Kingston with the tools for success.

This is clearly seen at the end of the book when the narrator finally confronts her parents, screaming out a ten-year list of angry complaints. Her mother, also a "champion talker," screams back, painfully making explicit the love for her daughter she had always felt was understood. Truth in the Chinese tradition must be presented indirectly. Care must be taken when using words because of their great symbolic power. Kingston finally sees this, and in so doing accepts part of her Chinese heritage while beginning to see in a new critical light the direct, American way she had been favoring. "Be careful what you say. It comes true. It comes true," she writes.

> I had to leave home in order to see the world logically, logic the new way of seeing. I learned to think that mysteries are for explanation. I enjoy the simplicity. Concrete pours from my mouth to cover the forests with

> freeways and sidewalks. Give me plastics, periodical tables, t.v. dinners with vegetables no more complex than peas mixed with diced carrots. Shine floodlights into dark corners; no ghosts. (p.204)

A tone of sardonic ambivalence, increasing as this passage develops, seems evident here. Any simplistic opposition must be questioned—logical vs. mysterious, American vs. Chinese, male vs. female. As Pearson and Pope explain, the new feminist hero must be a unifier of opposites, one who combines traditionally labeled "male" heroic qualities—power, assertiveness, simplicity, with "female" qualities—sensitivity, understanding, complexity. If, to use Kenneth Burke's term, art is actually a form of symbolic action, then Kingston in her role as artistic unifier becomes her own symbolic hero. In becoming a writer she has identified herself with the affirming voice of her mother who talks story, not with the subservient silent past. In a moving, synthesizing insight, Kingston is able to see this truth, indirectly labeling herself as hero in the process:

> The swordswoman and I are not so dissimilar. May my people understand the resemblance soon so that I can return to them. What we have in common are the words at our backs. The ideographs for revenge are "report a crime" and "report to the five families." The reporting is the vengeance—not the beheading, not the gutting, but the words. And I have so many words—"chink" words and "gook" words too—that they do not fit on my skin. (p.53)

SONG OF SOLOMON: THE HERO WITH A WOMAN'S FACE

Gail Griffin, Kalamazoo College

Toni Morrison's third novel, Song of Solomon, is painfully beautiful, wildly imaginative, one that haunts the dreams—or at least has haunted mine since I first read it four years ago. It is also stunningly radical. Diana Trilling has said that in modern fiction the woman's role is still "fundamental accommodation to male preference." Whether that is true is more than I can confront here. But against such a norm the radicalism of Song of Solomon defines itself even more clearly. For it is a novel in which not only does the primary female character not make any accommodation at all to male preference—in fact, she doesn't even acknowledge it—but the real story of the novel is one of male accommodation to what I would like to call female values. While there is not a trace of didacticism in Song of Solomon, I have always thought of it as the "compleat" feminist novel, containing both the paradigms that define, for me, what feminism is about: a woman literally self-created, drawing almost mythic power from her womanhood; and a perhaps even more radical phenomenon, a man who finds himself at the dry, dead end of masculinism and finally, through a long, painful birth process, makes a choice between a male heroic model and another which is clearly female.

Only Toni Morrison could get away with naming this novel's nuclear family "Dead." The Dead house is a model patriarchy, with Macon Dead dominating everyone and his values permeating every corner: acquisitiveness, control, hierarchy, repression, appearances, intense class-consciousness. They are the values of the white power group into which Macon Dead, a black man, has spent his life applying for admission, actively oppressing his own people in the process. Ruth, his wife, and his daughters, Corinthians and Lena, are utterly subservient to him. Macon, Jr.—"Milkman," the son and heir—is born into his father's power by virtue of a small anatomical appendage, as Lena tells him in her own brilliant outburst:

> You have yet to wash your own underwear, spread a bed, wipe the ring from your tub, or move a fleck of your dirt from one place to another. And to this day, you have never asked one of us if we were tired, or sad, or wanted a cup of coffee. You've never picked up anything heavier than your own feet, or solved a problem harder than fourth-grade arithmetic. Where do you get the right to decide our lives?
>
> I'll tell you where. From that hog's gut that hangs down between your legs. Well, let me tell you something, baby brother: you will need more than that. I don't know where you will get it or who will give it to you, but mark my words, you will need more than that. (215)[1]

He will need more; that's the story of this book. But at this point Milkman feels none of this power attributed to him. To the contrary, he feels utterly powerless, victimized, alien, bored, disconnected. "He avoided commitment and strong feelings, and shied away from decisions. He wanted to know as little as possible" (180). His life is a

---

1. All page numbers refer to Song of Solomon (New York: New American Library, 1978).

minus sign, a passive negation of his father. Yet his father's spirit has so imbued him that his world is truly Dead. And so, as Lena goes on to tell him, he is just like this man he hates so much. His minor rebellions against Macon play out the male myth described by Phyllis Chesler in About Men: the son, envying and threatened by the masculine power of the father, rebels, not to reject that masculinism, but to imitate it and seize it for himself. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Milkman's physical assault on his father for striking his mother. Lena's analysis of that episode is absolutely right: "You think because you hit him once that we all believe you were protecting her. Taking her side. It's a lie. You were taking over, letting us know you had the right to tell her and all the rest of us what to do" (215-16). Milkman's reaction to hitting Macon is "glee"; clearly the act has more to do with Macon than with Ruth. Milkman analyzes the incident in telling terms: "He was a man who saw another man hit a helpless person. And he had interfered. Wasn't that the history of the world? Isn't that what men did? Protected the frail and confronted the King of the Mountain?" (75) But as Lena knows, he does so only in order to become King of the same Mountain.

As for his actual feelings for his mother: "Never had he thought of his mother as a person, a separate individual, with a life apart from allowing or interfering with his own" (75). Milkman "had never loved his mother, but had always known that she had loved him. And that had always seemed right to him, the way it should be" (78). As for his sister, he "had never been able to really distinguish them (or their roles) from his mother" (60). His imitation of his Saturnine father includes the elder Dead's contempt for the women of his house.

The alternative power source in the novel lives on the other side of the tracks: Macon's sister Pilate, living with her daughter and granddaughter in a ramshackle house where they make wine. In every way the antithesis of the Dead household, they clearly represent a matriarchy directly opposed to the consummate patriarchal domestic nightmare Macon has created. Even Macon sees this opposition, in this revealing bit of fatherly advice: "Pilate can't teach you a thing you can use in this world. Maybe the next, but not this one. Let me tell you right now the one important thing you'll ever need to know: Own things. And let the things you own own other things. Then you'll own yourself and other people too" (55). And yet Pilate's power is undeniable —Pilate "who never bothered anybody, was helpful to everybody, but who also was believed to have the power to step out of her skin, set a bush afire from fifty yards, and turn a man into a ripe rutabaga—all on account of the fact that she had no navel" (94). This anatomical wonder is the striking emblem of Pilate's self-creativity. As Macon remembers it, his little sister literally got herself born, crawling out of their dead mother's womb under her own steam and leaving behind every trace of an umbilical cord. It is this power to self-create that terrifies everybody about Pilate—everybody except Milkman. Like a hungry, cold animal moving toward a fire, he moves into the circle of Pilate's strange light, drawn to a household where appearance and rule mean nothing, where love is free and abundant in all forms, where no holidays are celebrated because it is always Christmas.

The secret is that Macon, Sr., can understand this magic. Once, after a particularly harrowing day as slum landlord, he finds that some long-buried impulse in him is still vital enough to be drawn to the "women-ness" of Pilate's house: "Near the window, hidden by the dark, he felt the irritability of the day drain from him and relished the effortless beauty of the women singing in the candlelight. Reba's soft profile, Hagar's hands moving, moving in her heavy hair, and Pilate. He knew her face better than he knew his own. . . . As Macon felt himself softening under the weight of memory and music, the song died down. The air was quiet and yet Macon Dead could not

leave" (29). The femaleness of the place calls to his own softness—his childhood, his memory, his sensuality, the gentleness he has banished from his life.

Milkman's attraction to his aunt's domain has the same source. To his shock, he discovers that Pilate has had more to do with him than he thought: It was her potion which enabled Ruth to conceive; it was she who prevented Macon from having him aborted; it was she who brought him into the world. Another family secret is this collaboration between Ruth, who is everything victimized and weak in traditional womanhood, and Pilate, her inverse. Poor Milkman, resenting the female dominance in his life and seeking the shibboleth of "manhood," discovers that he has two mothers instead of the one he despises. Pilate, recalling the birth, pictures Milkman as a small battleground where forces of life and death—represented as feminine and masculine--war for his soul: "He come into the world tryin to keep from gettin killed. Layin in your stomach, his own papa was tryin to do it . . . . But he made it. When he was at his most helpless, he made it. Ain't nothin going to kill him but his own ignorance, and won't no woman ever kill him. What's likelier is that it'll be a woman save his life" (140). Pilate, the witch-woman, offers a wisdom to counteract that fatal ignorance, but it is a dangerously female wisdom, the wisdom of relationship, connectedness, obligation, sacrifice, as opposed to her brother's ethos of dominance, control, "owning things." For years she has carried the bones of a man she thinks she killed because "you can't take a life and walk off and leave it. Life is life. Precious. And the dead you kill is yours. They stay with you anyway, in your mind" (208). For Milkman, who wants what is called "freedom"—immunity from obligation, interference, the quicksand of family--such wisdom is truly sinister and he is not yet ready. His response to Pilate's magic is to begin a fifteen-year affair with Hagar, which becomes, as he grows into "manhood," ever more exploitive and loveless. The lure of the "freedom" and dominance of the traditional male hero is too powerful.

That freedom is represented by Milkman's other surrogate parent, Guitar Bains. Guitar is another side of the male myth that Macon embodies, but he is trickier, not as easily dismissed because he is often right, especially about Milkman. He says to Milkman, who has always dreamed of flying, "Wanna fly, you got to give up the shit that weighs you down" (179). The question is, what's the shit? Guitar is as weighted with masculinist baggage as anyone in the novel, and his new political commitment to a life of violence and revenge repels even Milkman. And yet they are twins, pledged to the same ethos: "Now they were men, and the terror they needed to provoke in others, if for no other reason than to feel it themselves, was rarer but not lighter. Dominion won by fear and secured by fear was still sweeter than any that could be got another way. (Except for women, whom they like to win with charm but keep with indifference.)" (177) Twice in the novel a brilliant white peacock appears like a messenger from another reality; and Guitar's response is to want to capture, kill, and eat it.

Inheriting a Dead world in which he is an alien, Milkman now has a clear choice between two heroic models: Pilate's and Guitar's. The one represents, as for his father, some lost, buried part of himself; the other is the seductive image the culture offers men—a quick fix for impotence and fear in the form of action, aggression, violence. Milkman rejects Guitar's political philosophy but readily, unthinkingly perpetrates an equally cruel emotional violence upon Hagar. Her demand for relationship, for an acknowledgement of fifteen years, is a threat to his "freedom." Her periodic monthly attacks are demands, as Guitar knows, not for Milkman's physical life but for his real, "living life." And Milkman doesn't know what that is, much less how to give it. "All he knew in the world about the world was what other people had told him. He felt like a garbage pail for the actions and hatreds of other people. He himself did nothing. Except for the one time he had hit his father, he had never acted independently,

and that act, his only one, had brought unwanted knowledge too, as well as some responsibility for that knowledge" (120). The more he strives for Guitar's and Macon's brand of "control" and "freedom," the more paralyzed and passive he feels: "Deep down in that pocket where his heart hides, he felt used. Somehow everybody was using him for something or as something" (165).

The only elements in his life which might break this masculine cycle of power and powerlessness are female; and at the point where Milkman heads south in search of the lost family gold, he comes to a few tentative, crucial realizations about them. One is that Pilate is, in fact, his spiritual mother. Another concerns the physical repulsion he has harbored toward his mother for having nursed him to such an advanced age. He confronts her, asking if she did indeed nurse him on her knees; she responds, "And I also prayed for you. Every single day. On my knees. Now you tell me. What harm did I do you on my knees?" (126) Lena's diatribe occurs at this point, painting a disturbing picture which he sees again in the act which finally determines his flight south. He and Guitar plan to rob Pilate of what they think is the gold, and in the planning of the robbery Milkman has an unprecedented sensation of "a self inside him . . . .a clean-lined, definite self" (184). Guitar's brand of aggressive action does bring to Milkman's helpless amorphousness a shallow and transient identity. They wind up in jail, rescued by Pilate, who debases herself for the white policeman in order to get them released. And suddenly Milkman sees himself in relationship to her: "Nothing was like the shame he felt as he watched and listened to Pilate. Not just her Aunt Jemima act, but the fact that she was both adept at it—and willing to do it—for him. For the one who had just left her house carrying what he believed was her inheritance" (209). At this moment, though he doesn't know it, the real obscured self of Milkman Dead raises its head.

To find it he must move forward by moving back, back into a family past in which he had taken no interest. Ostensibly his is a Macon-like search for gold. But he winds up following Pilate's footsteps, and Pilate's blood works its changes in his veins. Quickly the gold fades to insignificance and Milkman is searching for himself through the legends of his family and cultural pasts, drawn, as to Pilate, by a power he does not comprehend.

At this point the mystic elements in the book come out of hiding. Milkman's old realities disappear, along with his watch ("Damn. I'm losing everything." (294)), and more primal ones surface. As he forges rivers, explores caves, confronts the ancient woman Circe who preserved Macon's and Pilate's lives long ago and who now lives alone, surrounded by huge dogs, Milkman enters the realm of quest, trying on the heroic for size.

The bag of gold he <u>does</u> manage to find is a consciousness of belonging—to a family, a race, a human race, a tradition more vital than his father's real estate. He thrills at someone's reference to knowing his "people." As he stumbles onto more and more lost information and lost relations, "he was curious about these people. He didn't feel close to them, but he did feel connected, as though there was some cord or pulse or information they shared. Back home he had never felt that way, as though he belonged to anyplace or anybody" (292-93). Back home, belonging was a threat to freedom. Here in the south, at once more real and more unreal than Michigan city streets, he opens slowly to the wisdom that real selfhood comes through relationship, not apart from it. He discovers a pride in blackness much more profound than Guitar's bitterness. And at the same time he achieves a new independence in this place where his father's name can command interest but not subservience: "He earned the rewards he got here. None of the pleasantness was directed at him because of his father, as it was back home" (260).

Many realizations converge during an almost supernatural wildcat hunt, his initiation into the male community of Shalimar, Virginia, his family's old home ground. He loses the other men and then loses himself: "Under the moon, on the ground, alone, with not even the sound of baying dogs to remind him that he was with other people, his self—the cocoon that was 'personality'—gave way" (277). A new intimacy with nature continues to catalyze the new relation with himself and other people: "He felt the sweet gum's surface roots cradling him like the rough but maternal hands of a grandfather" (179). Maternal maleness? Is this what he is learning? In a rush comes a vision of his past relations with others:

> It seemed to him that he was always saying or thinking that he didn't deserve some bad luck, or some bad treatment from others. He'd told Guitar that he didn't 'deserve' his family's dependence, hatred, or whatever. That he didn't even 'deserve' to hear all the misery and mutual accusations his parents unloaded on him. Nor did he 'deserve' Hagar's vengeance. But why shouldn't his parents tell him their personal problems? If not him, then who? And if a stranger could try to kill him, surely Hagar, who knew him and whom he'd thrown away like a wad of chewing gum after the flavor was gone—she had a right to try to kill him too. Apparently he thought he deserved only to be loved—from a distance, though—and given what he wanted. And in return he would be. . . what? Pleasant? Generous? Maybe all he was really saying was: I am not responsible for your pain; share your happiness with me but not your unhappiness. (276)

In Virginia, Milkman discovers that another world exists on the far side of imagination where he can be reborn and start anew. Realizing that the song about Solomon that he has been hearing the children sing is in fact the story of his great-grandfather, he can reclaim his childhood: "I can play it now. It's my game now" (329). As a child again, he can see his family and friends with new eyes. His father suddenly appears to be the unwitting product of a system much bigger than he, wherein a black man's dignity and ability to survive may be wrapped up in his ability to "own things." In Virginia, Milkman finds love in his heart for Macon because he sees, through his new eyes, Macon's love for his own father: "That he distorted life, bent it, for the sake of gain, was a measure of his loss at his father's death" (300). And he comes to see that Guitar, likewise, with his passion for hunting and killing, is a victim of the same cruel masculine myth: "Something had maimed him, scarred him . . . like his own father" (278).

His awakening to the female side of the family is even more shattering and renewing. Thinking about his mother's loveless life, he makes a mammoth psychic leap to identify, for the first time in his life, with a woman: "The best years of her life, from age twenty to forty, had been celibate, and aside from the consummation that began his own life, the rest of her life had been the same. He hadn't thought much of it when she'd told him, but now it seemed to him that such sexual deprivation would affect her, hurt her in precisely the way it would affect and hurt him" (300). As his sympathy enlarges, his arrogance decreases: "With two exceptions, everybody he was close to seemed to prefer him out of this life. And the two exceptions were both women, both black, both old. From the beginning, his mother and Pilate had fought for his life, and he had never so much as made either of them a cup of tea" (331). In his initial liberation, he has a brief, intense affair with a local woman, which is decidedly different from his usual pattern:

> He soaped and rubbed her until her skin squeaked and glistened like onyx. She put salve on his face. He washed her hair. She sprinkled talcum on

> his feet. He straddled her behind and massaged her back. She put witch hazel on his swollen neck. He made up the bed. She gave him gumbo to eat. He washed the dishes. She washed his clothes and hung them out to dry. He scoured her tub. She ironed his shirts and pants. (285)

And when Milkman finally comprehends the Solomon myth, it is through feminized eyes, seeing a man who flew off and left a wife with twenty-one children: "Who looked after those children? Jesus Christ, he left twenty-one children!" (332) His childhood dream of flight, suddenly made real, must also be qualified by his new understanding of relationship and responsibility.

And so must this new freedom found in the Virginia hills, for when he arrives home, Hagar is dead. Before dying she tells her grandmother that Milkman doesn't like her hair. "How can he not love your hair?" Pilate asks. "It's the same hair that grows out of his own armpits. The same hair that crawls up out of his crotch on up his stomach. All over his chest. The very same . . . . It's his hair too. He got to love it" (315). For Milkman, the murderer, Pilate has kept a box of Hagar's hair. In accepting it, he accepts that Pilate is right: It is his hair—in his actual kinship with Hagar, in his long relationship with her, and in his responsibility for her death. He will carry it as Pilate has carried her father's bones.

Reintegrating the female in himself, he can stop victimizing it. When he goes south again with Pilate, he goes as her disciple, fully accepting her reality. As she dies in his arms, he says there must be one more woman like her. And his final act—in the novel at least—is in fact an imitation of Pilate: He literally offers his life to Guitar, as she has just offered hers to take the bullet meant for him. He follows the loving, sacrificial model of the women who have preserved him. Knowing that "without ever leaving the ground, [Pilate] could fly" (386), he finally understands flight: "If you surrendered to the air, you could ride it" (338). In other words, to fly, to have power, we must give ourselves over to the force that empowers, the life-force represented by the women in Milkman's life. The sad, poverty-stricken heir of the Dead, yearning for heroism, finally finds it—wearing a female face that looks very much like his own.

IMAGES OF WOMEN IN FILM

Starla Stensaas, Earlham College

An Introduction to Filmmaking

Film exists in a context of social, political, spiritual, and emotional elements. Like other art forms, film transmits a cultural heritage. Because film has traditionally been made by men, woman as an image in film represents the not-me or anima, the Jungian term for the male's projection of his female self in the unconscious. The anima image allows men to explore qualities they may not find desirable or acceptable in themselves, or qualities that may be in conflict with their concept of masculinity. Creating images or projections of women is a safe means for men to explore so-called non-masculine (and therefore unacceptable) qualities such as passivity, nurturing, deference to others, emotionalism, or physical weakness. Anima images of women also reinforce the status quo by affirming the patriarchal myth that women are defined only in relation to men —that women are extensions of men and male experience.

Many images of women on the screen, then, are not based in reality. They are not images of everyday women living everyday lives; instead, they are male projections and fantasies of what men cannot accept as part of their own identities. They illustrate men's perception of women as extensions of themselves. As women filmmakers, it is difficult for us to step out of our patriarchal view of the world to explore new images, new visions of what women can be in relation to themselves rather than to men. We are more likely than men to portray real women doing real things because we are real women doing real things, but we still find that much of our daily life is shaped directly by our relationships to men.

One direction for women filmmakers attempting to present a new vision and new images of women in film involves manipulation of the subtle emotional context of film, giving a new "feel" to old images. In film, the emotional context is generally set by three elements: movement, lighting and color, and juxtaposition of one image against another.

The most obvious element is movement. Like music, film develops rhythms. Movement is expressed in film by the movement of the subject and the movement of the camera. The subject can move with various rhythms within a scene or from one scene to another. The camera can move rapidly or slowly, from left to right or right to left, can zoom in or out, or can jump-cut from one scene to another.

Lighting is closely tied to color and can establish strong emotional connotations. Darkness can be womb-like and secure, or foreign and frightening. Light areas can be open and free, or stark and bare. Color, by the use of light, film, and filters, can be manipulated to evoke various emotional responses.

Juxtaposition of one scene next to another, particularly in editing, affects the emotional tone of each scene. For example, something perceived as representing innocence and beauty, when cut next to something dark and forbidding, can emerge as an image that is terrifying and ugly.

Hollywood has trained us to expect a particular emotional context. We name it "reality" and perceive it to be an image of day-to-day life, which in fact it is not. For example, women in movies are usually perfectly groomed or in a terrible disarray with their clothes half torn off. Women never have hair on their legs or blemishes on their face.

Women are attracted to men with the most weapons and power. Women never menstruate. Intimate couples never discuss contraception or venereal disease. No one ever goes to the bathroom.

Technically, Hollywood perpetuates this sense of the perfect reality by presenting us with perfectly edited, expensive film. Cuts are always smooth; juxtaposition of the images is comfortable, providing few surprises; lighting and color look realistic. We expect a beginning, a conflict, and a resolving of the conflict, and generally, that is what we get. In trying to imitate the flow and look of life, Hollywood presents us with a world without imperfection, an unreal world, a fantasy world.

Home movies, on the other hand, are technically imperfect, due primarily to economic limitations. The filmmaker is forced to show an imperfect world, usually with a cast of real people doing everyday things. As with Hollywood, however, the very act of shooting film objectifies what the filmmaker sees, puts it in a space away from the flow of our daily lives and asks us to pay attention to it.

We are immediately aware in the home movie that this is not Hollywood, that these people are being viewed by the filmmaker, that their actions are not refinements of a script and rehearsals, but are in some way a part of the flow of human action and movement.

Even in a real setting without acting, rehearsal or scripts, film results in the objectification of women by asking us to see the screen image as something separate and distinct from the world around us. Because we live in a sexist, patriarchal society, our meanings and interpretations reflect our sexist, male-oriented understanding of the world. This objectification of women tends to develop stereotypes. Perhaps the three most obvious stereotypes are the virgin, the whore, and the helpmate.

The virgin is a passive image associated with the Virgin Mary and Platonic ideas of spiritual form; she embodies a potential which is realized only through a relationship with a man and is defined by this potential relationship. The whore is usually portrayed as evil because as a society we feel sex is evil. She initiates the hero into the world of knowledge and experience rather than offering spiritual inspiration. She exists only in her desirability to men. The helpmate and mother humanizes man in his violent and aggressive struggle to dominate and control. Her role is defined in helping or serving man, particularly in raising his children.

The Films

Two films were shown during this session. The viewers were asked to note the emotional context of the film: how movement, light and color, and the juxtaposition of the images affect the viewer's perception of the meaning. The viewers were also asked to consider the stereotypes of the virgin, the whore, and the helpmate.

The first was a ten-minute film, titled Christine in the Spring by Ted, shot in 1970 in Iowa by Ted Quinn of Eastern Illinois University. The film opens on Christine Quinn, Ted's wife, dancing in a colorful dress in an open green field. Rays of sunlight are captured in the camera lens, emphasizing the spirituality of the scene and the virgin stereotype.

The film becomes a collage of the everyday activities of a housewife and mother, the helpmate stereotype, as Christine moves from her bed to the bathroom, where she uses the toilet and brushes her teeth. She completes various tasks including cleaning the

toilet and oven, sewing and cooking, dressing the children, playing with the children in the sandbox, reading to the children, and driving the family around in a station wagon.

Near the end of the film, Christine is working in the garden and offers a plant to the camera from many different angles and then proceeds to hang out the washing. During this segment of the film, images of Christine hiding like a wood nymph behind green leaves begin to intrude on the domestic scene. As the wood nymph imagery develops, Christine is presented with less clothing until she is moving from tree to tree naked. She is also shown running across a field in an open blouse. This sexual imagery, the whore stereotype, culminates with Christine lying naked in an open field with one leg raised as Ted, the filmmaker, hands his camera to his son and walks towards her.

In the conference session, discussion of the film focused on the relationship of the filmmaker to the woman being filmed. There was agreement that the moments Ted chose to film were not likely the moments Christine would have chosen. One participant commented that the film reminded her of a portion of D. H. Lawrence's work where a pregnant woman is dancing "for his pleasure." The participants were aware of the objectification of the woman in this film and found it particularly objectionable because it had been filmed by a man. The one man who attended asked if the group would feel the same if it had been filmed by a woman. The group agreed that it would be a different film if it had been made by a woman—particularly in the last scene where the filmmaker dominates both the woman and the screen. Another participant pointed out that this film would not be objectionable to a woman who had bought into the submissive helpmate myth; to her this film would be projecting a real woman in love.

The second film, Being Them, a thirty-minute film photographed and edited by the author, was made in response to the first film and other similar films. The film is divided into three parts, a slow opening of "stories," a transitional "confusion" section signified by changes in rhythm through the juxtaposition of images, and a healing or visionary section which attempts to break out of old images by exploring the beauty and potential in those images. All sections are cut with windows and bridges, which are both metaphors and attempts to develop an emotional context through changes in light and color as the film progresses.

This film opens on a woman washing an enormous pile of dishes. As she washes the glassware, the film is cut so that the same action is repeated several times. Long before all the dishes are clean, the scene changes to an older woman having a permanent. This scene leads to another of a woman grooming a poodle—complete with nail painting. The poodle is then replaced with two young boys in the bathtub being scrubbed by their mother. These are the opening "stories."

The tempo of the film then increases, with many different shots cut together to create a confusion of images. Tables that were once clean are seen full of flour again, faces that were once washed are being washed again, the woman having her hair permed fumbles over and over trying to hand the tissues to the hairdresser. This confusion is broken by the final section, longer and slower—the healing section, in which the more beautiful images of women are cut with long pans of the horizon.

The viewers were asked to consider if these images are true and believable, whether these women are defined in relation to men, and what the emotional sense of the film is.

Discussion of the film focused on its emotional context. Participants commented on the change in lighting, moving from dark images inside to light pans of the horizon outside. The lighting was also thought to reinforce the movement from old images of

women to the potential of new images. One participant commented that she was always trying to see what was beyond the windows.

The group was also fascinated by scenes which the filmmaker has labeled the "romantic image" of a brass hourglass, a long-stemmed wine glass and a vase of spring flowers. This image recurs throughout the film and is always followed by a "nowhere" image, such as a doorway that opens to nothing, a ladder that leads to nothing, a window that is nothing more than an empty frame. Several participants noticed this romantic image, and had an emotional response which was described by one participant as "being left at the altar." Another participant said this image suggested to her the expectation of a knight in shining armor who never arrived.

Participants compared this film to the first film, reaching consensus that the main difference between the films was that the women in the second film were doing pleasant tasks. The tasks, in and of themselves, are not pleasant, but the participants responded to them as pleasant because of their own past experiences with the same tasks. One participant commented on her own feelings of warmth and hominess during the bread-baking scene, feelings that were not only a response to the image on the screen, but to her own positive remembered experience in baking bread.

There was an agreement that although these women were performing the same tasks as Christine in the first film, these women were doing the tasks as choices. They were acting on woman-centered choices to perform the tasks rather than on a male-dominated vision of what tasks the woman should perform. The camera was watching rather than dominating.

CAPTURED ANGEL IN THE CENTERFOLD

Janet Swim, Hope College

Traditionally there have been two views of pornography, a conservative and a liberal view. While conservatives and liberals have argued about whether depicting sexual acts is immoral, feminists now claim the moral issue is not the depiction of sex, but the violation and exploitation of another person. Feminists distinguish erotica from pornography.[1] Erotica depicts a mutually pleasurable sexual expression between two people; pornography approvingly depicts women as a commodity for men's sexual pleasures and often incorporates violence against women. The implications of pornography reach farther than the issue of sexual mores. Pornography is an issue of power over women. As Gloria Steinem says, "Pornography is about power and sex-as-weapon—in the same way we have come to understand that rape is about violence and not really about sexuality at all."[2] These fantasies of power over women may be acted out in real life as rape. Robin Morgan related this idea when she said, "Pornography is the theory, rape the practice."[3] Given that pornography is an increasingly popular form of entertainment, it becomes important to ask, to what extent does it degrade women, hurt intimate relationships and actually promote violence against women.

Violence is becoming increasingly prevalent in pornography. For example, in a content analysis of 428 "adult only" paperbacks dating from 1968-1974, Don Smith found a number of violent themes. Of the 4,588 sex episodes he found, one-fifth of them were rapes. The average number of rapes per book was two in 1968, three in 1970-73, and four in 1974. Almost all the rapes depicted the victims first in terror and then in ecstasy. Four prominent themes emerged: the victim wanted to be forced to submit; the victim felt shame over her own physical gratification; the victims reported the rapes in less than three percent of episodes; and the rapist was rewarded with devotion by the victim.[4] Similarly, in 1980 Neil Malamuth and Barry Spinner conducted a longitudinal content analysis of sexual violence in the best-selling erotic magazines, Playboy and Penthouse. They found an increase in violence in the pictorials in both Penthouse and Playboy, while violent cartoons increased only in Penthouse.[5]

The ultimate portrayal of violence against women is found in Snuff films. In the 1970's a movie called "Snuff" was produced and was shown in cities such as San Diego, Denver, and New York City. At one point the film appeared to be over, but the movie continued in order to show the murder of one of the crew members. The following is a description of this final scene:

---

1. G. Steinem, "Erotica and Pornography: A Clear and Present Difference," in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, ed. L. Lederer (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), p. 37.
2. Steinem, p. 38.
3. R. Morgan, "Theory and Practice: Pornography and Rape," in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, ed. L. Lederer (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), P. 139.
4. P.B. Bart and M. Jozsa, "Dirty Books, Dirty Films, and Dirty Data," in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, ed. L. Lederer (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), p. 213.
5. N. Malamuth and B. Spinner, "A Longitudinal Content Analysis of Sexual Violence in the Best-Selling Erotic Magazines," The Journal of Sex Research, 16 (1980), 226-237.

> Then silence for a moment before the camera pulls back, and we see the production crew of the film talking about the success of that final scene. A pretty young blond woman who appears to be a production assistant tells the director how sexually aroused she was by the stabbing finale. The attractive director asks her if she would like to go to bed with him and act her fantasies. They start fumbling around in bed until she realizes that the crew is still filming. She protests and tries to get up. The director picks up a dagger that is lying on the bed and says, "Bitch, now you're going to get what you want." What happens next goes beyond the realm of language. He butchers her slowly, deeply, and thoroughly. . . . But the climax is still at hand. In a moment of undiluted evil, he cuts open her abdomen and brandishes her very insides high above his head in a scream of orgasmic conquest. The End. . .Fade into blackness. There are no credits listed in the final moments of the film.[6]

The movie distributors denied any actual murders. In any case, the name "Snuff" is now used to represent any other film depicting the actual killing of a woman for sexual pleasure.

Granted, all pornography does not explicitly depict violence against women. But all pornography does objectify women's bodies. The following is an example of a cartoon which clearly depicts women as objects.

> One of Playboy's lesser cartoons shows a naked man opening the door of a closet where a row of nude women are hanging upside down with knees bent from a rail. The male stands and looks them over as if he were selecting what tie, shoes, or suit he would wear today. Women are available, limp, inert, and unresisting, so that the all-powerful male can make his choice.[7]

Directly related to objectification of women is rape. Susan Brownmiller describes the philosophy that objectifies women in pornography as being the same as the philosophy of rape.

> We and our bodies are being stripped, exposed and contorted for the purpose of ridicule to bolster that "masculine esteem" which gets its kick and sense of power from viewing females as anonymous, panting playthings, adult toys, dehumanized objects to be used, abused, broken and discarded. . .this of course is the philosophy of rape.[8]

The portrayal and treatment of women as objects to serve or to be used by men is the basis of both pornography and rape.

Pornography is more than a reflection of societal attitudes about women; it is propaganda against women. Susan Brownmiller describes the paradox of accepting pornography but

---

6. B. LaBelle, "Snuff—The Ultimate in Woman-Hating," in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, L. Lederer (ed.) (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), pp. 273-274.
7. J.W. Drakeford and J. Hamm, Pornography: The Sexual Mirage (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1973), p. 19.
8. S. Brownmiller, Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape (New York: Bantam Books, 1975), p. 442.

not racist material. Liberals understand that Hitler's anti-Semitic caricatures and obscentities made genocide easier, and that tolerance of "nigger" jokes and dumb servant portrayals of blacks perpetuates racial discrimination, but they feel adult or "erotic" books and movies are a valid extension of freedom of speech.[9] Susan Griffin, in her book Pornography and Silence, extensively examines the relationship between propaganda against Jews, blacks, and women. "For the pornographic mind and the racist mind are really identical, both in the symbolic content and in the psychological purposes of the delusionary systems they express."[10] Griffin states that it is an error to claim that the Nazi propaganda was printed in order to justify the eventual murders. Although this is true on one level, examining the deeper level shows that the propaganda contributed to a delusionary system. The racist then needed to believe in this delusion and acted it out.[11] The same is true about pornography.

> The chauvinist mind is more loyal to its own mythology than to reality. Thus, this mind begins by establishing delusions over nature. But these events must be dissatisfying. After he has ritually whipped a woman, the pornographer returns to himself and his own natural feelings. After he has pronounced his power invincible, the Nazi must return to the vulnerability of his own body; therefore, the mind captured by such delusion must accelerate the effectiveness of delusion. Real incidents must occur. Real human beings must be ridiculed, raped, punished or murdered. And finally, real lives must be replaced with the documents of their destruction.[12]

Pornography is anti-female propaganda because it promotes and incites the oppression of women.

Some analysts, such as G.L. Simons, claim that pornography is educational to the reader and "that males, at any rate, reap psychological benefit from pornography."[13] Censorship of pornography is seen as a repression of human sexuality. Repression, in turn, leads to sexual problems.[14] Simons even asks, "Where else can a person learn about deviant sexual behavior?"[15]

However, the sexual behaviors taught in pornography are distortions. Pornography often portrays men, women, and the sexual act violently. In addition to the portrayed enjoyment of pain, pornography

> depicts a lovestyle that causes sex problems. Sex media have a great deal to do with the genitals but almost nothing to do with mutually fulfilling lovemaking. They confine their interests to "fucking and sucking," a preoccupation which is a major turnoff to women and a leading cause

---

9. Brownmiller, p. 443.
10. S. Griffin, Pornography and Silence: Culture's Revenge Against Nature (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), p. 158.
11. Griffin, pp. 182-183.
12. Griffin, p. 187.
13. G. L. Simons, Pornography Without Prejudice: A Reply to Objectors (London: Abelard-Schuman, 1972), p. 90.
14. Simons, p. 53.
15. Simons, p. 101.

> of men's sex problems. Using pornography in sex education makes as much sense as using films of bloody highway accidents as driver training.[16]

Objectification automatically puts emotional distance between two parties. Not only is the sexual act itself distorted, but also those participating in the intercourse, including men. When men are portrayed in pornography, they are detached and regard woman as an accessory. For example, in films, the men do not make any sounds indicating any sense of pleasure. The 8mm peep shows are silent. The sounds during sex in the 16mm films are limited to women saying, "'What a magnificent cock!', 'Fuck me,' 'Oh, fuck me harder,' and moans and groans bordering between pleasure and pain."[17] The men's silence characterizes them as unemotional and in control. When they do speak it is to give orders. As Michael Astleman, a sex counselor for men, says, "If sex were not assumed to be enjoyable for men, the audience would be hard-pressed to find a scene in any X-rated film where the men appeared to be enjoying themselves."[18] Another harm to men comes from the exalting of the large penis. The assumption is the bigger the penis, the better the sex. Women are assumed to be drawn to men with large penises. In reality the size of the penis has nothing to do with sexual enjoyment. As Masters and Johnson say, "Penile size usually is a minor factor in sexual stimulation of the female partner. The normal or large vagina accommodates a penis of any size without difficulty."[19] Despite the reality, pornographers still endorse a principle of "the bigger the better." There are even products men can buy in order to increase their penis size. An ad for a vacuum enlarger in Hustler said, "Some men might still believe that it's not the size of the sword but the swordsmanship. We won't argue the point, but wouldn't you rather go into battle with a lance than a dagger?"[20] For many men, concern over penis size is more than a joke. A survey of 1000 men by Penthouse Forum in March, 1976 reported, "All respondents, with the exception of the most extraordinarily endowed, expressed doubts about their sexuality based on their penile size."[21] Jim Peterson, the Playboy advisor, says the most frequently-expressed concern expressed in letters he receives is penis size.[22]

The images of women are also grossly distorted in pornography. Within pornography women usually fit one of two roles. They are either virgins caught and raped or nymphomaniacs who can never be satisfied. The most popular portrayal combines the two roles: the woman is first a virgin and then becomes a nymphomaniac. Women are portrayed enjoying and achieving fulfillment from violent rape. The following excerpt from Playboy typifies the portrayal of women in pornographic literature. In this paragraph the woman is violently raped for the first time:

> When she opened her eyes, she saw them all staring at her from the darkness. With no warning, Marcello slid into her, and as she folded her hands around his neck, she screamed in pain and pleasure. The crowd made a noise, too, a single long sigh. As Marcello pushed rapidly and insistently in and out of her, opening her like a fresh wound, the faces in

---

16. M. Castleman, Sexual Solutions: An Informative Guide (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980), p. 185.
17. Castleman, p. 188.
18. Castleman, p. 188.
19. W. H. Masters and V.E. Johnson, Human Sexual Response (Boston: Little, Brown, 1966), p. 195.
20. Castleman, p. 36.
21. Castleman, p. 31.
22. Castleman, p. 30.

> the crowd all came nearer like sentries closing their ranks, until they pressed against the two of them. Engrossed in the feelings aroused in her by Marcello, she barely felt the multitude of hands on her, hands which kept on feeling her feet, stroking her calves and thighs and breasts, brushing over her shoulders, caressing her hair, her neck and her cheeks. Lost in a single sensation, her body one with the body of the man driving into her. . . . (emphases mine)

During the course of this story she is raped several more times. But in the concluding paragraph the woman is portrayed as having enjoyed the man's repeated attacks.

> With sudden clarity, she saw that during those months together it was she who, with palpable abandon, had been using him, to bridge the sexual expanse that, before she met him, she had felt gaping open in her. Now because of what she had learned from him, that distance was bridged, and she was whole.[23]

In actuality, rape is not enjoyable or fulfilling but traumatic. The experience does not leave a woman feeling whole; it leaves her feeling vulnerable and fearful.

Pornography does not teach about sex. It presents detached sexual behavior, unemotional men, sex-starved women: errors damaging to self-images and destructive to sexual relationships, and images which promote and endorse violence to women.

A favorite argument in favor of pornography is the catharsis argument: that is, pornography will decrease men's likelihood to commit sexual crimes because they will be sexually satisfied by the pornography. It would seem more logical to assume that men are attracted to pornography because it excites them rather than because it appeases them.

However, the highly influential 1970 "Technical Reports of the Commission of Obscenity and Pornography" comes to the opposite conclusion: "Empirical research . . . has found no reliable evidence to date that exposure to explicit sexual material plays a significant role in the causation of delinquent or criminal sexual behavior among youth or adults."[24] Many faults have been found in the experimental methods used in the research. But the main criticism of applying this research to today's pornography is that its material does not typify the violence which is prevalent today.[25] As Irene Diamond, from Purdue University, points out, "In many of the experiments most of the materials the subjects were shown might be more properly classified as sex education materials rather than the amalgam of sex, violence, and woman hatred which typifies pornography in the real world."[26] The Commission emphasized results which agreed with its notion that pornography should not be censored. For instance, the study reported Goldstein's research, which said that "rapists had no greater likelihood of encountering material containing sexuality and aggression (sadomasochistic theme) than the controls, so that the idea for the aggressive sexual act does not appear to derive from pornography."[27]

---

23. Kosinski, "Pinball," Playboy, March, 1982, pp. 112-114.
24. Diamond, "Pornography and Repression: A Reconsideration of 'Who' and 'What'," in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, ed. L. Lederer (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), p. 195.
25. Diamond, pp. 195-199.
26. Diamond, p. 198.
27. Bart and Jozsa, p. 212.

However, further analyses of the data, after the Commission's report, found that although there was little difference between rapists' and control subjects' use of pornography during adolescence, there was a dramatic difference during preadolescence (ages six to ten). Specifically, thirty percent of the rapists and only two percent of the control subjects reported exposure to hard-core pornographic photos. Furthermore this latter study reported that "only rapists stand out in reporting a significantly earlier age of peak experience" and "only rapists report more frequent exposure than controls for the most vivid experience."[28]

One mistake the Commission made was to report prematurely results from the Denmark experience. Denmark legalized all pictorial pornography in 1969. It was claimed that legalization would decrease the number of rapes because men would buy pornography instead of raping women. As predicted, legalization did not cause more sex crimes, according to a report by Berl Kutchinsky. In fact, Kutchinsky reported that the number of sex offenses decreased. This would seem to be evidence for catharsis. However, this conclusion is rash because some sex crimes, such as voyeurism, were decriminalized at the time pornography was legalized. The data on the number of sex crimes prior to legalization included not only rape but also flashers, peeping toms, and other milder sex offenses. After legalization many sex crimes were not included in the data. Therefore, the number of sex crimes Kutchinsky reported was probably falsely deflated.[29]

Within the past two or three years a number of laboratory experiments have examined the effects of aggressive pornography on men. Aggressive pornography is defined as a depiction of women being mutilated or aggressed against within a sexual context or women being raped. Overall, the studies have found that aggressive pornography increases aggressive behavior directed against women, increases aggressive sexual fantasies, produces greater acceptance of interpersonal violence against women, and alters perceptions of rape.

Dr. Edward Donnerstein and colleagues, at the University of Wisconsin, have done numerous studies on aggressive behavior produced after viewing pornography. When studying the effects of film type, Donnerstein found that aggressive-erotic films, in comparison to neutral and erotic films, caused increases in aggression toward both males and females when male subjects were angered. The number of aggressive actions toward females was higher than that toward males. He found that even non-angered male subjects increased their aggression toward females after the aggressive-erotic films.[30]

Donnerstein and Leonard Berkowitz studied the differential effects on angered and non-angered males of depicting rape as either enjoyable or unenjoyable for the woman. They found that seeing a woman abhor rape increased only angered males' aggression against females. However, they found that seeing a woman enjoy rape increased both angered and non-angered male subjects' aggression against females. Donnerstein and Berkowitz hypothesized that only angered males increased aggression in the first stituation because seeing the women's pain in the film reinforced the actual retaliation

---

28. P.B. Bart and Jozsa, p. 196.
29. P.B. Bart and Jozsa, pp. 208-209.
30. E. Donnerstein, "Aggressive Erotica and Violence Against Women," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (1980), 269.

they performed in the lab. But both angered and non-angered males increased aggression after seeing the women enjoy the rape because the enjoyment lowered inhibitions.[31]

Exposure to aggressive-erotic pornography has been found to have effects in areas other than increased aggression toward women. For instance, Neil Malamuth and James Check, at the University of Manitoba, found that men had created more aggressive fantasies after seeing an audio-visual presentation of a rape than men who saw a presentation of two consenting adults.[32] Other studies have examined the effects of pornography on attitudes about rape. In 1970 Donald Mosher found that exposure to pornography did not increase sex-calloused attitudes but rather decreased these attitudes. The descriptions of the pornography used, however, seem to imply the films were erotic, not pornographic. "Mosher admitted using 'better-than-average' films that showed 'more affection than is typical of much pornography,' and fewer genital closeups."[33] Recent studies have found that exposure to aggressive-erotic films does affect attitudes. For example, in a field experiment, Neil Malamuth and James Check found greater acceptance of violence against women by men after viewing a violent-sexual film.[34]

Individual differences between male subjects have effects on attitudes, aggression, and arousal after viewing pornography. The primary difference in males deals with self-assessed rape proclivity. John Briere, Neil Malamuth and Joe Ceniti measured the likelihood of rape by asking the following question:

> "If you could be assured that no one would know and that you could in no way be punished for engaging in the following acts, how likely, if at all, would you be to commit such acts?" Among the sexual acts listed--including possibilities such as "group sex" and "bondage"--were the two acts of interest in the present study: "forcing a female to do something she really didn't want to do" and "rape."[35]

Over 50% of the subjects reported some likelihood of either force or rape, given the right circumstances.[36] The likelihood of raping was unrelated to sexual frustrations or sexual maladjustment but was related to the following attitudes: "Victims are responsible for their rapes, rape reports are manipulations, male dominance is justified, ... women enjoy sexual violence, and acceptance of domestic violence."[37] These attitudes are similar to attitudes found among rapists. Those who admit some likelihood of raping are also more likely in the lab setting to aggress against women.[38]

---

31. E. Donnerstein and N. Malamuth, "Pornography: Its Consequences on the Observer," to appear in : Sexual Dynamics of Anti-Social Behavior, ed. L.B. Schlesinger (Springfield, Il: C.C. Thomas, in press), p. 10.
32. Donnerstein and Malamuth, p. 20.
33. D.E.H. Russell, "Pornography and Violence: What Does the New Research Say?" in Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography, ed. L. Lederer (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), p. 219.
34. N. Malamuth and J. Check, "The Effects of Violent-Sexual Movies: A Field Experiment," Journal of Research in Personality, 15 (1981), 21.
35. J. Briere, N. Malamuth and J. Ceniti, "Self-Assessed Rape Proclivity: Attitudinal and Sexual Correlates," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, 1981, pp. 4-5.
36. Briere, Malamuth and Ceniti, p. 5.
37. Briere, Malamuth and Ceniti, p. 6.
38. N. Malamuth, "Rape Proclivity Among Males," Journal of Social Issues, 37, pp. 147-148.

In summary, aggressive-erotic films will increase aggression against females even if the viewer is not angry. Seeing women enjoy rape increases the likelihood of aggression. Furthermore, exposure to aggressive-erotic films increases rape fantasies, increases sexual arousal, decreases sensitivity to rape, and increases acceptance of rape myths. These results are even stronger for those men who have a high likelihood of raping.

Clearly some control of pornography is warranted. The billions of dollars spent each year on pornographic entertainment buy more than just magazines or books or admission to a skin flick: they buy women's bodies and keep women's bodies as a commodity on the market. The exploitation of women found in pornography is invading our daily lives. The exploitation is encountered in advertising, on album covers, on billboards, on special cable TV programming, and even in video games. But pornography is the greater threat, for as its influence spreads into all forms of the media it is becoming ever more violent. The distortions of sex and images of maleness and femaleness are detrimental to relationships and to men and women; even more, the increasing violence is brutally dangerous to women's safety and to women's lives.

THE HURT THAT LASTS FOREVER

Karmen Meyer, Holland, Michigan

Why don't we talk about incest? Because it doesn't happen very often? Because it won't happen to our families? Or it won't affect us personally? Because it makes us feel uncomfortable?

I am a survivor of incest. I'm going to speak out and get your attention. I want you to consider incest.

There is much to be learned about incest, and even if adults who are confronted with the issue every single day refuse to consider it, children will be exposed to understanding. As children realize their rights, feel free to voice their opinions, and know where they can get help and exactly what will happen to their family, these children will not allow themselves to be abused. Just because a child speaks out against abuse doesn't mean the problem will go away. Counseling the family is very difficult, and many homes are broken. But what are the alternatives?

If the child—let's assume it's a girl—does not speak out she will probably be abused for a number of years. If the offender is her father, he will be overcome with guilt and anger at his circumstances or he will grow hard, uncaring and bitter. The mother probably has no idea of what is happening and will alternate between feelings of love for her husband, confusion over his moodiness, and a sense of desperation about herself as a whole person.

The child will grow up with a distorted sense of what it means to be a child and how mothers and fathers should care for and relate to their children. She will lose her trust in men and will probably experience a variety of unhappy relationships with people in general. If she does become involved with a man and a child is born of the union, that child is likely to be sexually abused. The original victim, afraid to confront her own trauma because incest is not something you talk about, will unknowingly become trapped in a situation much like her mother's. Thus, her own husband or lover may be the facsimile of her father. The potential abuser does not come with a brand on his back identifying emotional voids. So, although this woman will not be aware of the potential trouble, she may never learn that there is other acceptable behavior in men, she will not know how to relate to any kind of man except the abuser, and she will desperately want to believe that a man can demonstrate the good qualities of expression of love, sense of humor, and emotionality without the negative effects of abuse. She will want to love her model role, not realizing that this type of man is likely to abuse her own child. What do you think should be done about this situation?

We're deceiving ourselves if we believe we're protecting children when we only warn them of the harm strangers can cause and fail to mention that relatives, such as uncles and aunts and grandparents, close friends of the family, and even fathers or mother, can also take advantage of children. More likely than not the child will be familiar with the abuser.

As a young child of eight or nine years, I knew better than to climb in the car with a stranger or take candy from someone I didn't know. But I didn't know what to do the day my dad called me in from playing outside with my brothers and led me into his workroom, pulling down my bathing suit and looking closely at my body. I thought it best to keep quiet when he made me promise not to tell my mom, to keep the little

"secret". And I didn't really understand what had happened. At first, I thought there was something wrong with my body, that my dad was checking to make sure everything was okay. When the incidents began to happen regularly, I sensed something was wrong, but already I felt trapped. My dad had confided to me that if I told anyone he would have to go to jail. It seemed like a cruel and final punishment for something I didn't really understand. As I grew older, it would not seem enough of a final solution; I became certain if my dad went to jail, he would come to "get" me when his term was finished. He frightened me because in many other ways he seemed like a perfectly normal father. I could not understand him emotionally.

And in many ways I loved my father. He fed me continual praise, telling me how beautiful I was, how talented, how intelligent. He reminded me again and again that I could grow up to be anything I wanted, often even listing typically male occupations as possibilities, which seemed incredible to me. Actually, all I wanted to be was a wife and mother, creating my own warm family atmosphere, without the burden of sexual tension. But my dad urged me to consider a career for myself. He was always offering possibilities. At one point I became intrigued with flying. Without hesitation he was positive that I could become the pilot of a jetliner if I wanted. I could hardly believe it myself. It seemed that only men were pilots. He gave me the constant impression that I was equal to or better than men. He tried to make me feel special. We would go shopping together, with him pointing out the things he wished he could afford for the family. He told me often how much he loved his family, especially my mom. At Christmas and holidays and her birthday, he and I would go shopping for a gift for Momma. We always had a difficult time finding something just right for the woman we both loved so much.

My mom was and still is a tender, loving, and giving person. I adored her. It has only been in the last few years I've been able to give her human qualities, realizing her true strengths and weaknesses, instead of worshipping her as a saint. I think I became so confused with the negative side of my parent the father that it became crucial for my parent the mother to be perfect in my eyes. This was relatively easy to do since she is a beautiful person. She worked hard to create special moments in our childhood. When we came home from school she would greet us with her full attention and warm cookies from the oven. She eagerly participated in many of our activities, sensing our joy and sharing it. To me as a child, it seemed that she had a wonderful relationship with her husband. They were outwardly affectionate with one another, and from subtle hints and from what my dad would tell me, even as a child I could guess that they had a good sexual relationship. It seemed that they never fought; perhaps once a year they would openly disagree on something, and then my dad would often grudgingly give in to my mom. What I know now as an adult is that my mom never voiced her opinions; she just gave in to my dad unless it was very important to her. But as a child I could not see that. I only knew if I told anyone I would be breaking up the family and causing my mom a lot of pain.

At least I felt reassurance that if I told my mom or one of my grandmas, I would be believed. It is crucial to a child to know she will be trusted, when her own trust has already been cruelly destroyed by the abuser. But the closeness I shared with my mom was not enough. When I was twelve years old, my dad progressed from fondling and viewing my body to stripping away my virginity. He tried to be gentle and careful, but it was clear to me there was no choice. I tried to block out of my mind what was happening. I focused on family events and school activities, but once a week when my mom went out shopping for groceries, with my brothers playing quietly and innocently unaware in the living room, my dad would lead me up to my bedroom and reality would come crashing in. This continued for most of my teenage years. Looking back, I don't

know how I made it through all those years. I have come to realize that the mind can block out an incredible amount of pain. Even now I can hardly stand to think back on what happened. I force myself to remember how confusing it all was. My dad would quickly and quietly rape me, then hurriedly I would pull my pants back on, and he would open the door ajar in case one of the boys wandered up. Often I would cry. He'd tenderly wipe away my tears, sometimes apologizing, telling me what a wonderful daughter I was and how much he loved me. He would come out with one of his little speeches, reminding me that "happiness is a state of mind" and "you just have to make yourself cheerful." He would lead me back downstairs. Then perhaps he would read one of the classics, such as Kidnapped or Treasure Island, to me and my brothers, or we'd all play a game of Monopoly or cards. "Let's make some popcorn," he'd suggest, "we're going to have some fun tonight!" Can you even imagine how confused I felt? I always thought it best to put the incidents out of my mind, to forget about it, to bury the past, and spare my mom the grief.

When I was about sixteen years old my mom went to work to help alleviate financial problems, against my father's wishes. Recently she told me that my dad had told her how he worried that if she got out and met more people, she would find someone "better" than he and leave him. She was surprised that he would worry and assured him that she loved him. However, she did grow as a person; she became more self-confident and independent. You could call it "growing feminist awareness." My parents began to argue all the time. This no longer bothered me, though. I came to believe that my mom no longer loved my dad and would divorce him. I relished his absence. I realized I no longer had to submit to my dad, and the next time he approached me I told him that he was never to touch me again. I no longer had to protect their marriage. I was becoming strong and feeling more in control than I ever had before.

My parents were separated and my dad moved out. I seriously considered telling my mom what my dad had done, but I could see no point in hurting her. Then I met a very special man. Falling in love was a time of joy and delight. I was an innocent eighteen years old, childlike in my needs of love and caring, mature in my understanding and sensitivity. I think another part of the pleasure was simply having the pressure of my dad's presence removed. It was so wonderful to have this new feeling of freedom; I truly wanted to forget the past. So I locked all the bad thoughts away and began to go for days, then sometimes weeks, without remembering the hurt.

Meanwhile my dad underwent some drastic changes in his life. At first he became very depressed and lost a lot of weight. Later he told me that he had re-evaluated his whole life, that he was sorry for all the wrong things he had done in the past, and that he wanted to begin a new life and keep his priorities straight. This was to be a short-lasting proposition, but I wanted to believe him. My mom at this time was having a very hard time making it on her own financially. She and my dad began to visit each other. Before I knew it, my dad had moved back in the house and it looked like everything was going to work out all right.

Duane and I were married. Family was important to both of us. I wanted so desperately to believe my family shared the same warm, loving atmosphere I sensed with my husband's family, so we visited my mom and dad often. Unfortunately, the closeness was not there with my family. My parents no longer loved one another, and my dad reverted back to his old ways of putting himself and his concerns first. I began to see him as a totally selfish person and to lose any sense of feelings for him as a father. Any time my dad was in the same room with Duane, I fought hard in my mind to prevent any bad thoughts from coming to the surface. At the same time I remembered

how important it had been to me, as a child, to anticipate having with my father the joys I would know as an adult. Why was I now denied a normal father/daughter relationship?

But just over a year ago Duane and I gave birth to a beautiful little girl. Now it became impossible to visit my family casually. When my dad would lovingly pick up my baby girl, I had horrifying visions of what might happen if this little girl grew up trusting and loving her "Grandpa." I began to have nightmares every night. The stomach cramps I endured as a child came back to haunt me, remind me, prod me. It had been sixteen years of silence, but the dam broke. I went to my father one night and told him I would never be able to trust him and could no longer bear to be around him. I told my husband and mother everything that had happened. It was the hardest thing I have ever done in my life.

Duane was loving and supportive, luckily for me, because I know I wouldn't have had the strength to believe in myself. More than once I remember, in the months that followed, I would feel myself become emotionally cold, numb from the realization of pain the incest caused me and the family. Sitting on the floor watching my baby crawl around and feeling that I didn't care if I lived to see her grow up, I felt the same scary feeling I had as a child. Every time I was sick to my stomach or vomiting, the pain would intensify, and I would feel as if I hated all that life had to offer.

I've talked with my dad only once in the last year. I tried to explain how much pain he has caused; I tried to get him to seek counseling and accept the blame. He still believes that I've blown things out of proportion and although he says he's sorry, it's always offered with excuses for the unhappy childhood he had and his own unrealized dreams. My mom has been in shock and emotional depression for almost a year now, but in the last few weeks she has begun to come around. I believe she will survive as a whole person.

I also believe the ignorance and silence that we all share must be removed. We must talk about incest. It is the "secret" that hurts forever. Even among professionals who deal with child abuse, there are too many misconceptions about the types of people one will commonly find in the incestuous family. There is outrage expressed towards the "tyrant" father, a lack of compassion for the supposedly-conspiring mother, and rejection of the child-seducer-victim. Although my personal experience illustrates the most common type of incest, father/daughter incest, many other types of incestuous relationships also exist. Mother/son incest appears to be quite rare, but many professionals note that it is extremely damaging, since men who are victims of incest learn to act out aggression and often become perpetrators themselves. Other types of incest include mother/daughter, grandparent/grandchild, aunt-uncle/niece-nephew, and brother/sister. I will refer to the father/daughter relationship because this is the area in which I have concentrated my research, but I do not mean to imply that women are never the offenders in cases of incest.

From my own experience and extensive study of incest, I have come to believe that you cannot put a neat label on the types of personalities involved. Incestuous families share only some degree of emotional problems and the broken bond of trust; neither of these symptoms is easily visible or understood.

In other words, the offender and the victims are not easily distinguished from other members of society. As in the case of my father, the offender may be hard-working, intelligent, creative, affectionate, and outgoing, and hold a high-paying position in his community. Yet the notion persists that the father is sexually unfulfilled, a drunk and a common criminal. My story certainly denies these assumptions.

The mother, like mine, might be warm and loving, trying to be the good housewife and mother that society dictates—"happy and fulfilled" in her role—and totally unaware of the situation. Yet repeatedly in my research on incest, respected therapists concluded that the mother contributes to the conditions of incest by having to work nights or being bed-ridden or having to go to the hospital. Those of us who are aware of feminist issues know that it is unfair to place responsibility on the woman, unless she is involved as an actual perpetrator. The person who commits the crime must accept responsibility for his actions, even if the conditions or circumstances of his life led him to the unfortunate end.

The child may give few if any clues of the sexual abuse. I remember enjoying family and social events and skipping happily to school, which was an emotional and intellectual release for me. I remember talking with my mom about nearly everything, except the "secret" of course, and when she explained how to avoid confrontations with strangers, it did not occur to me to voice my concerns about "Daddy."

We cannot rely on outward signs of abuse. All children must be told that no one —including brother, sister, aunt or uncle, grandpa or grandma, or mom and dad—is allowed to touch the child in any way that makes her or him uncomfortable. The names of family members must be listed to show that we really mean it when we say that no one is allowed to abuse another.

There are other things we must do to avert child abuse. Any child who even mentions being uncomfortable about going home after school or not liking a parent, or who becomes withdrawn or unmanageable in school, deserves attention. Teenagers who become drug or alcohol abusers or sexually promiscuous are giving obvious signs of trouble, although not always from incest, but the chance is there. Children are to be believed. They are not yet aware of explicit sexual behavior and do not have the conceptual ability to "make it up."

We must insist on personal counseling for all runaways. Statistics show that at least one-third of these children are trying to escape incestuous situations. Communities need complete cooperation between all the agencies that become involved in suspected child-abuse cases: the police, the prosecuting office and all those involved in the courtroom process, Protective Services, and therapists. A model program initiated in San Jose, California demonstrates that the process of investigation and resolution can operate successfully. Let's imagine that a child mentions to a teacher or neighbor that she is uncomfortable when her father comes home from work. Whether the police or Protective Services are contacted by the concerned citizen, both agencies will immediately become aware of the situation through mutual communication. Within twenty-four hours, an investigator from Child Protective Services will interview the child. If abuse is suspected, even if the child has only been fondled, a crime has been committed, and the investigator insists the father leave home immediately, or the police are called in if necessary. The entire family, including siblings, is brought in for therapy. In the ideal situation, and it happens often with this type of program, the father admits his guilt and seeks help. San Jose has a 95% confession rate. The father will spend a minimal amount of time in jail. The jail term satisfies the father's personal need and society's need for punishment, emphasizing that the perpetrator is responsible, and increases motivation in therapy. Many men are given work-release time, so they don't lose their jobs. The mother, father, and victim are given nine months of comprehensive treatment, then nine months of peer support in group therapy.

If the family wishes to reunite and therapists feel assured the abuse will not continue, a trial arrangement is made with frequent visitation. Family members are strongly

encouraged to attend social groups, such as "Parents United" and "Sons and Daughters United," where social relationships are encouraged through group activities. Professionals are often involved in these social groups, but not to monitor activities or discussions. The goals of this highly successful program are to: (1) keep children out of foster homes; (2) reduce emotional trauma, including the "system trauma" of having to deal with all the various agencies and probing investigators; (3) reunite the family when possible and if the family desires; and (4) assume responsibility for the child's safety if the perpetrator returns.

Not everyone or every family can be helped by this type of program. Kathleen Faller, author of "Sexual Abuse," has worked extensively with incestuous families in Michigan. She believes that unless the perpetrator has a definite sense of guilt and is willing to undergo extensive therapy, there is no hope for the family. In these cases, the child is often removed from the home and placed in foster care. While this may be unfortunate for the child's emotional well-being, one thing is made clear: extensive family therapy is expensive, and society is willing to spend only so much time and energy on this problem. When incest becomes a talked-about issue, as I'm sure it will in this decade, perhaps more funds will be appropriated.

But talking about incest is still difficult. Incest embarrasses people. Survivors sense this discomfort, rather than emotional support. We have been forced into silence because the frightened hush the cries. Ignoring the issue discourages a solution.

Easily 10-30% of our nation is directly affected by incest. Are you ready to talk about it?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

Allen, Charlotte. Daddy's Girl. 1980.
Armstrong, Louise. Kiss Daddy Goodnight. 1978.
Brady, Katherine. Father's Days. 1980.
Butler, Sandra. Conspiracy of Silence: The Trauma of Incest, San Francisco, CA: Volcano Press, 1978.
Forward, Susan and Craig Buck. Betrayal of Innocence: Incest and Its Devastation. Los Angeles, CA: J.P. Tarcher, 1978.
Herman, Judith Lewis. Father-Daughter Incest. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
Justice, Blair and Rita Justice. The Broken Taboo: Sex in the Family. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1979.

Magazines:

"Child Sexual Abuse," Child Today, 10 (Nov/Dec, 1981), 26-7.
"Epidemic of Incest," Newsweek, 98 (Nov. 30, 1981), 68.
"Incest: A Rational Look," Ms., 10 (Nov., 1981), 61+.
"Incest: The Ultimate Family Secret," Glamour, 79 (Nov., 1981), 154+.

BROACHING THE ISSUE: HOMOPHOBIA

Audrey Glenn, Denison University and Jane R. Dickie, Hope College[1]

Imagine engaging in daily activities—child care, meeting friends, employment, church attendance, falling in love—all with a sense of risk and danger. This society's largest invisible minority lives with intolerance and incomprehension from parents, brothers, sisters, peers, teachers, doctors, ministers, all of the people from whom one would expect and need warmth and support. To understand gay men or lesbians, we must first understand the largely hostile homophobic character of our society. Misinformation and stereotypes about this minority abound and serve to oppress us all.

After defining homophobia and the resulting myths about homosexuality, this paper suggests ways that homophobia can be addressed in the university community.

Defining Homophobia

We can define homophobia simply as fear of homosexuals. It is a fear which pervades our culture and is evident as a socialized belief system or cultural message as well as an individual personality characteristic.

As a socialized belief system, fear of homosexuality is a very powerful force maintaining traditional sex-roles. Men and women who fear being labeled gay/lesbian because it is seen as less desirable are inclined to act more in line with traditional sex-roles.

Homophobia is a belief system that supports negative myths and stereotypes about homosexual people. Specifically it is a belief system which 1) holds that discrimination based on sexual orientation is justifiable; 2) maintains and encourages the use of language and slang, such as "queer," which is offensive to gay men and lesbians; and 3) does not value homosexual life-style equally with heterosexual life-style. This has also been called the heterosexual bias. Specifically, it indicates that anyone who is heterosexual is superior to anyone who is homosexual.

Homophobia is correlated with other beliefs. People who express the most negative attitudes toward homosexuals are more apt to believe in traditional family ideology, that is, to value the dominant father, submissive mother, and obedient children. They also hold more traditional views of women. People who express negative attitudes toward gay men and lesbians also hold more traditional religious beliefs. In fact, traditional religious views are apt to predict both negative attitudes toward women and negative attitudes toward homosexuals, particularly in men (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978). Finally, men who were rated most homophobic held constricted views of sex-appropriate behavior more than those who were least homophobic. Homophobic men tended to suspect that any male who had "feminine characteristics" was homosexual (Smith, 1971). It appears that as we are learning cultural messages about what men and women should be and do, we are also learning the cultural message of fearing and hating gay men and lesbians.

---

1. We would like to express our appreciation to Eve Adams for her participation in developing and facilitating the program which was the source of this paper.

Homophobia is frequently viewed as a personality dynamic. Homophobia would then be defined as an irrational fear or intolerance of homosexuality or homosexuals. Here it is a specific phobic condition rather than a generalized cultural attitude. As a personality dynamic, some theorists speculate that fear of one's own sexual impulses is translated into homophobia. People who are more homophobic are also apt to be more authoritarian, more dogmatic, more rigid, more intolerant of ambiguity, more status conscious, more guilty and negative about their own sexual impulses, and less accepting of others in general (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978).

Myths about Homosexuality

A result or by-product of homophobia is the maintenance of myths and stereotypes about homosexuality. Specific myths give rise to and support oppression of gay men and lesbians. Beliefs that gays are dangerous, sick, untrustworthy, and threaten one's personal safety or beliefs that lesbians are hyper-sexed or sexually aggressive toward unwilling partners, serve to support legal and social restrictions that are placed on gay men and lesbians. Several myths pervade our culture. We must recognize them for what they are: attempts to deny civil rights and a sense of humanity to gay men and lesbians.

Myth 1: "Homosexuality is against religion—it is a sin. The whole Bible is full of admonitions against homosexuals. The early church recognized it and it's always been this way." Actually the Bible says very little about this issue. Most people are amazed to learn that Jesus Christ never said anything about homosexuality. When they peruse their Bibles they find very little mention of the issue at all. The early Church never used the five or six proof texts so often used today to condemn homosexuality. And certainly the early Church could not have had the understanding of homosexuality that we have today (Boswell, 1980).

Presently, many Christians and Jews use the Bible to justify sentiments such as homophobia. Most theologians recognize that the Church's interpretation of the meaning of scripture and its doctrinal stance is not infallible. The church is a Reformed Church, that is, continuously in the process of reformation. Yet some who look at the Bible as a source of sure doctrine do not even bother to do serious Biblical scholarship. Lack of Biblical scholarship fosters reading into the Bible a concept of homosexuality that probably did not exist in the time that it was written (Boswell, 1980).

The passages currently used against homosexuality deal predominantly with cultic prostitution and gang rape, and have little resemblance to our current understanding of sexual orientation and loving relationships between same-sex individuals. As Lutheran theologian Helmut Thielicke (1964, 1965) points out, "even the New Testament does not provide us with evidence of normative dictum with regard to this question. I believe that even pious ideas are forbidden if their purpose is to fill our gaps which God obviously left open." There are gaps in the Bible about the homosexual question. To fill in these gaps even with pious ideas may be a sinful thing to do, particularly when this leads us to judgment of other persons.

Finally, serious people within the church have pointed out that the sin of homophobia, which is a persecution of lesbians and gay men, is certainly to be condemned. The New Testament messages about pride are clear: no heterosexual person has the right to feel pridefully superior to gay men or lesbians.

Myth 2: "Homosexuality is a sickness." The American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association dropped homosexuality from their lists of diagnostic disorders in 1973 and 1974, respectively. Early studies indicated that homosexuals had emotional difficulties stemming from early childhood experiences. However, early research on lesbians and gay men was predominantly done with those who were in psychiatric treatment. Of course, this is sampling error. If one only studies people in psychiatric treatment, one will find them to be psychiatrically disturbed! However, more recent research on a cross-section of heterosexual and homosexual populations has found that gay men and lesbians express and show the full range of mental health. And gay men and lesbians who accept their sexual orientation are no more nor less emotionally healthy than heterosexuals (Bell and Weinberg, 1978).

Myth 3: "Homosexuals are child molesters." Statistics from Boston Advocate indicate that over 90% of child molestation is performed by heterosexual males. Other studies have reported that all child molesters (pedophiles) who also engaged in sexual relations with adults were heterosexual (Burgess, Groth, Homstrom and Sgroi, 1978). Pedophilia has a different etiology entirely than does homosexuality. Child molestation is a serious problem, but it must not be confused with sexual orientation.

Myth 4: "Homosexuality is a reaction against the other sex." The notion that homosexuals have had bad experiences with the other sex, and therefore don't appreciate the other sex, has not been supported by recent research. A study of over 1500 heterosexuals and homosexuals indicated that early childhood experiences of molestation were not predictive of sexual orientation. Homosexuals had no more of these sorts of experiences than did heterosexuals (Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith, 1981). Further study of gay and straight men exposed to pictures of nude males and females showed that the gay men did not show any aversion to females; rather, straight men showed an aversion to males (Freund, Langevin, Gibiri and Zajac, 1973). So it appears that it is not an aversion to women, but rather an attraction to men that leads gay men to homosexual orientation.

Myth 5: "I don't know any lesbians or gay men." The reason that this is not likely to be true is that estimates of the percentage of gay men/lesbians in the population range from 4% to 15% (Livingood, 1972). In our culture there is a terrible cost for identifying oneself as gay or lesbian. People are very reluctant to do so, especially with a non-accepting person. So, most of the gay men and lesbians we know do not identify themselves. This is one of the main reasons myths can persist: the invisibility of gay men and lesbians. Those who would violate the stereotypes and myths just do not make themselves known.

Myth 6: "Lesbians or gay men force themselves on unaccepting people." Women in our culture learn how to turn down unwanted sexual advances from men without undue alarm. As with heterosexual relationships, a simple "I'm not interested" usually suffices to terminate the relationship. In fact, there is some evidence that in the case of heterosexual relationships, 31% of college women have experienced "date rape" (Wilson, in press). So, heterosexual relationships may be more susceptible to this charge! Fears of seduction may indicate that one is not entirely comfortable with one's own sexuality. Finally, gay men and lesbians have less interest than heterosexuals in making the "mistake" of approaching a person who will reject them, for there is great risk in revealing one's homosexuality.

Myth 7: "Homosexuals are over-sexed." This myth capitalizes on this culture's ambivalent feelings about sexuality, and it may relate more to one's own uneasiness with sexuality, i.e., fear of one's own sexual feelings projected on the other. This

particular myth has been used against many oppressed groups. In any event, research does not support this myth. One study related to this issue compared the number of orgasms that gay and straight men had per week. Gay men averaged 1.3 orgasms per week. Straight men reported 3 orgasms per week (Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, 1948). This is certainly not the definitive statement on sexuality, but it contradicts the myth that homosexuals are oversexed.

How are these Myths Manifest?

Attitudes toward homosexuals have been changing. However, homophobia still serves to oppress. A Gallup poll (1977) indicated that 56% of Americans think that homosexuals should have equal rights in terms of job opportunities. However, when questioned further, respondents revealed specific cases of resistance to equal opportunity. When asked whether gay men and lesbians should have access to jobs such as elementary teacher, 55% of the population said no; should gay man and lesbians have access to being clergy, 54% said no; should gay men and lesbians have access to being a doctor, 44% of the population said no. The one occupation to which the general population thought homosexuals should have equal access was that of interior decorator! Sadly, only 43% felt that homosexual relations between consenting adults should be legal. Only 14% of the population believed that homosexuals should be able to adopt children.

Broaching the Issue: How?

Assuming the view that a university community is a microcosm of society, much of what has been previously discussed concerning homophobia occurs within the campus community. Ten percent of the student population is likely to be gay or lesbian, and a much larger percentage is likely to experience homophobia or hold homophobic beliefs. Because homophobia and the resulting myths serve to oppress and damage people, members of the university community need to care about dispelling false ideas and bringing light to these issues. But how?

A variety of "large scale" programs can address both homosexuality and homophobia. A primary goal of such programs would be to increase the level of information and awareness. In terms of program format, lectures, films, and panels are recommended as less threatening tools for addressing a larger, more diverse audience. The opportunity for small group discussion following these programs is ideal for aiding the audience in personalizing the information and sharing reactions. These discussions could occur in the classroom or the residence hall, with the caution that the facilitator be both knowledgeable and sensitive to the topic. The least threatening format would be an external (i.e., not from the campus community) lecturer sponsored by an on-going lecture series, if one exists at the university. At the small liberal arts college, several academic departments can combine their efforts to support this type of programming. For example, the religion and history departments might support a lecture on the "history of homosexuality in the church." Lenton (1980) expounds on the use of films and panel discussions in university-wide programming as well as in smaller academic or residence hall programs. He recommends framing the program broadly to increase the audience --for example, offering a program on "Sex and the American Woman" rather than a program on the lesbian feminist movement.

For smaller, intact groups, values clarification is an excellent tool. The goal of this format is to encourage participants to identify their own values about homosexuality. Each exercise consists of 10-20 statements towards which participants state their degree

of agreement (i.e., strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, strongly disagree. Note: a "neutral" category is not offered.) Participants can respond to a paper-pencil questionnaire individually and then discuss responses or use a more active, and risky, format of physically placing themselves on the agree-disagree continuum by moving to different corners of the room. Each corner is clearly labeled as strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, strongly disagree. Participants are then asked to share why they placed themselves on the continuum as they did. A "ground rule" is set whereby any participant can choose not to share the reasoning behind a response, although honest participation is encouraged (and necessary) for the success of this format.

The content of a values clarification exercise can be varied according to the needs and comfort level of the participants. Items can be derived from "myth statements" similar to those discussed earlier in this paper. To increase the challenge, and thereby the risk-taking of participants, more personalized statements can be included. Some examples are: 1) It would not bother me at all if a child of mine were gay; 2) I am more comfortable with lesbians than gay men; 3) If a friend of mine told me that she/he were lesbian/gay, I'd feel we had much less in common than we had previously; 4) It would not bother me at all if someone thought I was gay/lesbian; 5) If I were gay I'd feel something was missing. Statements can be developed to address homophobia within the specific university community, for example: 1) Our group (or organization) has a responsibility to combat homophobia on campus; 2) Homophobia does not exist in our community; 3) A lesbian/gay man who came out on our campus would be harassed. Because of the potential for a threatening experience, caution is advised in terms of choosing a facilitator as well as in identifying participants.

Consciousness-raising can also occur in the classroom setting. Faculty can give assignment options that deal with homophobia. They can include examples of gay men and lesbians in lectures. When lecturing or encouraging discussion, faculty can work to avoid heterosexual bias. For example, rather than asking students in Developmental Psychology when they plan to marry, one can ask when, if ever, they expect to be partnered in a long-term relationship. For most of the students that means marriage, but the 10% who are gay/lesbian can also fit into the question. The classroom can also be the setting for the variety of programs discussed earlier, especially films and panel discussions on the topic of homosexuality/homophobia. Including the topic of homosexuality in courses like Developmental Psychology, Philosophy of Feminism, or Social Psychology rather than in a course in Abnormal Psychology also sends a subtle yet important message to the university community about what it means to be gay/lesbian.

Students can take an active role in the classroom in raising their own awareness, as well as that of their professors, by choosing paper/research topics about homosexuality. For example, in an Introduction to Religion course, a student can choose to write about Biblical interpretations concerning homosexuality. In a Physiology or Biology course, a student can review the evidence (or lack thereof) for chemical/hormonal imbalance "causing" sexual preference.

Broaching the Issue: By Whom and For Whom?

It is the opinion of the authors of this paper that responsibility for raising the issue of homophobia must be shared by faculty, administrators, counselors, and students. Those with the skills, knowledge and sensitivity can be directly involved with campus-wide programming that addresses homophobia as well as provides support for gay/lesbian students on campus. Others can share responsibility by attending campus programs, by

offering financial support, by announcing programs and encouraging attendance through their classes, residence halls, or campus organizations, and by requesting/offering program suggestions to those with facilitative expertise (e.g., counseling staff, student life staff).

In discussing ways to broach the issue of homophobia it becomes clear that the responsibility must be shared by gay/lesbian and non-gay/lesbian members of the university community. The level of risk placed on the shoulders of lesbian and gay male students, faculty, and professional staff is often too high. Someone identified as "straight" is less likely to become a target of the homophobia we have been discussing.

Likewise the programming on campus needs to be targeted at both non-gay/lesbian students (especially those experiencing homophobia) and gay/lesbian students. This paper has expounded mainly on the former group. Development of gay and lesbian support groups (Fein and Nuehring, 1975; Gibbs and McFarland, 1970, and Lenton, 1980), a formal or informal peer counseling network (Lenton, 1980), and non-homophobic counseling resources (Clark, 1977; Woodman and Lenna, 1980) may be needed to address the needs of the gay/lesbian community.

Broaching the Issue: Why?

Minimally, the goals of programs on homophobia and homosexuality are to raise awareness and offer support for a gay/lesbian life-style. Ideally, attitude change would be a result.

This paper assumes that attitudes can be changed. But is this so? Whether attitudes can change will depend somewhat on the strength of the belief system that supports homophobia. One investigator found that many middle-class college age men, for example, had not adopted firm positions about alternative life-styles (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978). If this is true, then it may be that many college age men, and perhaps women as well, have simply not had their attitudes toward sexuality challenged. This may mean that they will be open to hearing about alternatives, as opposed to firmly entrenched against them.

Attitude change often follows, rather than precedes, behavioral change. If people change their behavior, then sometimes change in attitudes will follow. In one study, therapists were trained to work with gay clients. One of the assignments was an excursion to a gay bar. The authors report that spending time with gay and lesbian individuals did more to dispel homophobia than all the books and discussions that covered the topic (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978).

Several studies have indicated that modifications in people's attitudes toward homosexuality have been highly correlated with independent measures of self-esteem (Weinberg, 1972). If this is so, then attempts to change people's attitudes must not be accompanied by belittling or attacking those whose attitudes we wish to change. Providing experiences and information, coupled with encouragement, to examine one's own feelings or fears or threats, will certainly be more effective.

Individuals within our culture are afraid of lesbians and gay men. Why the fears? Why the myths? Perhaps gay men and lesbians, by their very existence, challenge family values in a culture which encourages heterosexuality and prizes marriage above all. In other words, acceptance of lesbians and gay men forces heterosexuals to look at their own values and life-styles. This can be very difficult, and at times very threatening,

but in the interest of human rights and enlightenment, this is a challenge that we as a campus community must accept.

REFERENCES

Bell, Alan P. and Weinberg, Martin S. Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Bell, Alan P., Weinberg, Martin S., and Hammersmith, Sue Kinfer. Sexual Preference: Its development in men and women. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Boswell, John. Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Burgess, Ann Wolbert, Groth, A. Nicholas, Holmstrom, Lynda Lytle, and Sgroi, Suzanne M. Sexual Assault of Children and Adolescents. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1978.

Clark, D. Loving Someone Gay. Millbrac, Ca.: Celestial Arts, 1976.

Fein, S. and Nuehring, E. Perspectives on the gender-integrated community: Its formal structure and social functions. Homosexual Counseling Journal, 1975, 2(4), 150-89.

Freund, K., Langevin, R., Gibiri, J., and Zajac, Y. Heterosexual aversion in homosexual males. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1973, 122, 163-169.

Gallup, G. Gallup poll on the attitudes homosexuals face today. The San Francisco Chronicle, July 20, 1977, p. 4.

Gibbs, A. and McFarland, A. Recognition of gay liberation on the state-supported campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15(1), 5-7.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., and Martin, C.E. Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia, PA.: W. B. Saunders, 1948.

Lenton, S. "A student development response to the gay issue." In F. B. Newton and K. L. Ender, Student Development Practices. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1980, 266-287.

Livingood, John M. (Ed.) National Institute of Mental Health task force on homosexuality: Final report and background pages. Maryland: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972.

Morin, Stephen and Garfinkle, Ellen. Male homophobia. Journal of Social Issues, 1978, 34, 29-47.

Smith, K. Homophobia: A tentative personality profile. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 1093.

Thielicke, Helmut. The Ethics of Sex. New York: Harper and Row, 1964, p. 284.

Thielicke, Helmut. Between Heaven and Earth. New York: Harper and Row, 1965, p. 108.

Weinberg, G. Society and the Healthy Homosexual. New York: St. Martins Press, 1972.

Wilson, W. Rape and attempted rape of college women. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, in press.

Woodman, N. J. and Lenna, H. R. Counseling with Gay Men and Women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1980.

INCREASING FEMALE PARTICIPATION IN THE MATHEMATICS CLASSROOM

Pansy Waycaster Brunson, DePauw University

Introduction

Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 was intended to prevent educational discrimination on the basis of sex. Since the passage of Title IX, the number of women entering college has greatly increased. In fact, 1982 is the third year in a row which has seen the number of women enrolled in college exceed that of men (McCormick, 1982). But in spite of the fact that more women are entering college, there is still a low enrollment of women in what have been traditionally masculine fields, such as mathematics. It is this fact which concerns post-secondary educators.

Background

Marlaine Lockheed, a research sociologist, has challenged the implication that sex desegregation will bring about educational equity. She explains that the intention of Title IX is to ensure equity of educational benefits to males and females through integration of classrooms; however, integrating classrooms does not, in and of itself, guarantee equity of educational benefits. In fact, integrating the classroom may do as much harm as good (1976a, p.4). A recent report (Hall, 1982) issued by the Project on the Status and Education of Women (PSEW) supports Lockheed's claim. Hall suggests (pp. 1-2) that women students in mixed-sex classes may not experience the same educational benefits as men. She claims that the standard educational programs perpetuate the stereotypic differences between men and women in achievement. How then, do we change the educational setting to ensure that women not only have access to higher education but also experience educational opportunity at a level equal to that of their male colleagues?

First, we need to look at the leadership patterns in mixed-sex groups. In her research on groups, Lockheed (1975) has consistently found that in "mixed-sex groups, men are more active than women, are more influential than women and are more task oriented than women" (p.2). She argues that leadership in mixed-sex groups is typically conceded to the males because both men and women expect males to be more competent at a task than females. According to Lockheed, this expectation is based on the relative value accorded men and women in society. Findings in Hall's report (1982, p. 8) support Lockheed's argument.

Lockheed used a game to study the female leadership patterns in single-sex and mixed-sex groups. In her study (1975, p. 6) Lockheed expected greater difference between the amount of activity exhibited in the game by males and females in naive mixed-sex groups than in experienced mixed-sex groups. Experienced groups were composed of individuals who had first played the game in a single-gender group. The results (1976b, p. 44) confirmed her expectations. This finding suggests that first experiencing, in groups of one's own gender, these activities which might occur in mixed-gender situations is a powerful treatment in itself. Lockheed (p. 60) goes on to recommend that as long as the curriculum is identical, math groups might initially be sex-segregated.

Procedure and Results

In Spring 1980, at a midwestern university, an all-female section of an introductory math course was offered in addition to the other five mixed-sex sections. It was found that women who selected the all-female section had lower math ability scores (SAT), yet at the end of the course these same women attained higher achievement scores than women in the mixed-sex classes. But women in both groups, single-sex and mixed-sex, had significant decreases in level of math-anxiety during the term, so that the greater achievement gained by women in the all-female section could not be attributed to reduced levels of math-anxiety. Also, returning women students (over twenty-five and away from the academic setting at least five years) performed better in the all-female class. And, finally, there was a lower withdrawal rate in the all-female section. It should be noted that there was no difference in class format for the all-female and mixed-sex sections; the only difference was group gender.

Discussion

Since group gender was the only difference in the classes, the obvious question, in view of Lockheed's work, concerns the difference in class participation for the women in the two groups. On three occasions during the semester, an observer sat in on each of the six sections to record student participation. Participation was defined by the number of volunteer responses (questions or answers) during class lecture. The table on the next page categorizes the data.

Class Participation—Total Responses (male and female)

First, the greatest number of total responses occurred in sections 3092, 3093 and 3106. In an attempt to understand this observation, let us consider the characteristics which distinguished these sections from the others. Section 3092 was the all-female class, and some of the comments made by women in this class offer some possible explanations of the greater classroom participation:

> I enjoyed being in the all-female section. I didn't feel inhibited to ask questions at all.
>
> This course is set up so well (that) it makes learning fun. It is the only class I have had that I feel totally at ease with the instructor. . . . I think it is helpful to have an all-female class. It relieves pressure.
>
> I think girls communicate better where there is an all-girl class.
>
> I thought that I'm not that good in math, I tend to be more shy. I feel really stupid, anyway—so that would just make it easier when you're around girls.
>
> I never felt intimidated in the section with men, but (in the all-female class there is a) more relaxed atmosphere and less overall tension.
>
> The women's section was good in meeting other females.

Although fear of competition with men was the reason many of these women chose the all-female section, it was not the sole reason. Some women selected this section to meet and interact with other women. Regardless of their reasons for choosing the all-

Record of In-Class Participation

Obsevation	Gender	Section	% Female	Total # Responses	% Female Responses
Observation 1	All-Female	(3092)	100	42	100
Feb. 11, 1980-	Mixed-Sex	(3100)	58	12	83
Feb. 13, 1980	Mixed-Sex	(3096)	48	24	38
	Mixed-Sex	(3094)	58	13	54
	Mixed-Sex	(3106)	47	62	81
Observation 2	All-Female	(3092)	100	66	100
March 3, 1980-	Mixed-Sex	(3100)	50	24	63
March 5, 1980	Mixed-Sex	(3096)	62	20	7
	Mixed-Sex	(3094)	65	41	85
	Mixed-Sex	(3093)	50	45	7
	Mixed-Sex	(3106)	42	35	34
Observation 3	All-Female	(3092)	100	14	100
March 31, 1980-	Mixed-Sex	(3100)	63	19	47
April 2, 1980	Mixed-Sex	(3096)	56	12	58
	Mixed-Sex	(3094)	67	20	85
	Mixed-Sex	(3093)	42	34	13
	Mixed-Sex	(3106)	50	29	100

female class, it seems reasonable, in light of their greater class participation, to expect greater achievement from these women, which indeed was the case.

Section 3093, also with high numbers of responses, was the only mixed-sex class which had a female instructor. This fact leads one to consider the possibility that female math instructors elicit greater classroom participation than male instructors. A 1973 study of coeducational junior high classrooms (Good, Sikes, and Borphy, pp. 77,84) found that classes taught by females seemed to be more relaxed, more discussion-oriented, and more active, with greater student willingness to initiate interactions. It is ironic, however, that most of the responses in this section were made by male students, even though the instructor was female. More will be said on this point later in this paper.

The third section with high numbers of responses was 3106—the only evening section. Many of the students in this section were returning adult students—students who had been away from the educational setting for several years. Perhaps these students, with their experiences in non-academic settings, were more eager to become involved in class discussions in order to apply abstract mathematical concepts to real-life situations.

Class Participation—Percentage Female Responses

Another interesting aspect of the data in the table is the percentage of the responses made by females. Aside from the all-female section (100% female responses), the highest percentage of female responses occurred in the evening section. As mentioned earlier, many of the students in this section were returning students. In particular, most of these returning students were women—women who were very active in class discussions. Perhaps women who are away from the academic setting for a long period of time are just more active when they return to the classroom. The sense of camaraderie these women felt, accidentally clustered together in the evening section, may have freed them to interact. This possible explanation originated from a comment made by a returning woman student during the first week of class:

> At registration, I told them I didn't want the women's section. But in my class there are so many young people. I thought maybe there would be more older women in this section.

Had this student known that there were several returning women in the evening section, she probably would have been just as willing, or maybe even more willing, to switch to the evening section. It appears that this woman, like the women who selected the all-female class, was in search of a section with students like herself—the same sex, the same age or having had a similar period of absence from the academic setting.

Another intriguing observation about percentage of female responses is that all of the mixed-sex sections having high levels of female participation (3100,3094, and 3106) were taught by males. And, ironically, the section having the lowest percentage of female responses (3093) was taught by a female, even though this section had the highest overall total numbers of responses—male and female. This occurrence leads one to ponder the effect of the interaction between sex-of-teacher/sex-of-student and group gender on classroom interaction patterns. Remarks from two women in the all-female section support the idea that sex-of-student/sex-of-teacher has an impact on participation patterns.

> Well, I just feel more at ease with female math teachers.
>
> I think it's easier to talk to females, overall, than the male teachers. Most of the male teachers were . . . not understanding enough.

But why, then, were the women more reticent in the only mixed-sex section taught by a female? Maybe they were subdued by the aggression of male students in the classroom —an aggression accentuated by the fact that this male-dominated subject area was being taught by a female.

Implications

In the present study, no final answers were found to these questions—only speculations. The answers lie in future research involving class participation patterns among women. According to Dale Spender in The Times Educational Supplement (Hall, 1982, p.7):

> In mixed-sex classrooms it is often extremely difficult for females to talk, and even more difficult for teachers to provide them with the opportunity. This is not because teachers are supremely sexist beings, but because they are governed by the same rules as everyone else.

When and how will we change these rules? In 1973, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) recommended that "until women are better prepared psychologically to compete with men in the classroom, there is a case for experimentation with special sections for women in large introductory courses" (p.74). Perhaps these experimental all-female classes can provide a learning climate which will free women to become more confident in classroom interactions, thus giving them the experience they need for work in future mixed-sex groups, whether it be in classroom or in nonacademic settings.

The CCHE report goes on to say (p.78) that these courses should be presented within relevant existing departments, since the ultimate goal should be to provide equity of educational opportunity to women. Assuming that this is the ultimate goal, educators must, in addition to providing interim all-female math classes, also work within the framework of coeducation to bring about changes in the curriculum which will achieve equity of educational benefits for men and women. Until research uncovers these needed changes and they are implemented in the curriculum, coeducational mathematics classrooms will retain their chilly atmosphere for women.

REFERENCES

Brunson, Pansy Waycaster. The Relationship Between Achievement of Women in an All-Female Basic Algebra Class and the Achievement of Women in Mixed-Sex Classes. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1980.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Opportunities for Women in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Good, Thomas L., Sikes, J. Neville, and Brophy, Jere E. Effects of Teacher Sex and Student Sex on Classroom Interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65(1), 74-87.

Hall, Roberta M. The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One For Women? Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges, 1982.

Lockheed, Marlaine E. Legislation Against Sex Discrimination: Implications for Research. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, 1976. (a)

Lockheed, Marlaine E. The Modification of Female Leadership Behavior in the Presence of Males. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., March 31-April 3, 1975.

Lockheed, Marlaine E. The Modification of Female Leadership Behavior In The Presence of Males (ETS PR 76-28). Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976. (b)

McCormack, Patricia. More women than men are now attending college. Bloomington (Indiana) Herald-Telephone, August 15, 1982.

PANEL PRESENTATION: BEING SENSIBLE, OR SELLING OUT?

THE PROBLEM: IDEALISM AND ACCOMMODATION IN THE FEMINIST TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACADEMY

Linnea Vacca, Saint Mary's College

We are all, I think, as feminists affiliated with mainline institutions—for so the GLCA colleges are—caught in an ambiguous situation. The values we cherish must be, to at least some degree, hostile to the institutional status quo that employs us. We may not envision ourselves as radically threatening as Adrienne Rich's phrase "disloyal to civilization" implies, but we're certainly rocking the boat. Yet, on the other hand, perhaps you, like me, wonder if we're rocking it enough, and fear possibly not. Almost all of us, it's simply inescapable, have had to declare some sort of personal truce, effect some sort of personal compromise, in order to have achieved our status within our institutions. I'm an atheist teaching at a Catholic college. The more I started to fit into that college, the more tempered, the less public, my anti-religious attitudes became. The school didn't intimidate me: the situation was far more subtle, and far less easily dealt with, than intimidation would have been. It just isn't polite to bite the hand that feeds you, for one thing. One way or another, I got sensible. My militantly anti-Catholic grandfather might say I'd sold out. I obviously can't afford to think so. But it makes me wonder.

When it comes to questions of feminist commitment, well, that makes me wonder even more, and more generally. Last winter I attended the national meeting of a major professional organization. At one of the feminist caucuses, women on the way up in academe (especially in administrative tracks) paused to reassure their less successful colleagues that power wasn't really corrupting them. Rather, they said, the view from higher up the mountain—higher up the pyramid, to use Peggy McIntosh's keynote image—was different from what they'd seen before. Other considerations now intruded in their decision-making and they could no longer afford to be as polemical as they had been. They were, they said, in a sense victims of practical realities; if it seemed they were now abandoning their sisters . . . well, they were sick with grief over it, but they just couldn't do what or all they'd thought they could. They were trying, and true, they now apparently did have some sort of power, but . . . .

One young woman, a very junior faculty member at an Eastern college, finally rose to speak. Her voice broke from time to time; she spoke through tears. I have no idea if she spoke from a particular personal situation—I assume so—or what it was, what betrayal she perceived or thought she perceived in what former friend now turned administrative foe. But her anguish was real and her conclusion implacable. The only moral position, she insisted repeatedly, the only moral position for a committed feminist was to disconnect from all occasions to power.

This young woman in her anguish, and even more in her relentless insistence on moral purity, reminds me of the Antigone who is the protagonist of Anouilh's version of her story. In that play, as in Sophocles', Antigone's two brothers Eteocles (the "good" brother) and Polynieces (the "bad") kill each other in battle. Creon, their uncle, decrees that Eteocles be given a state funeral while Polynieces remain unburied and dishonored. Young Antigone buries Polynieces despite Creon's edict, her sense of duty telling her it was the right thing to do. In Anouilh's version, which differs from Sophocles' after this point, Creon tries to persuade Antigone to abandon her attempts to bury the bad brother, since public policy clearly demands revenge for Polynieces' attempted treachery

against the city. If Antigone would simply let Creon do what needs to be done, he (Creon) will protect Antigone from the sentence of death she incurred by burying her criminal brother. When Antigone refuses again and again to compromise her ideals, Creon finally explains to her—proves to her—that both of her brothers were immoral thugs, that he really doesn't know which corpse was which but that he chose the prettier of the two carcasses to honor, the other to revile. The very stability of Thebes, Creon insists, and I believe we are to think him right in the play, depends on the clarity and effectiveness of the public presentation he is making with the two bodies, not on idealistic notions.

Creon's arguments convince Antigone of only one thing—that she cannot tolerate life any longer. So she persists in her defiance until Creon is forced to begin the political actions that will lead to her arrest and eventual suicide. If the world Creon revealed to her is what adult life is really like, she wants no part of it, no part of compromise, of practicality, of "realism." This young idealist fears above all that if she stays alive she herself will be contaminated and corrupted by the world, that she will become "sensible" and "reasonable" like Creon.

It's a touching story, in a way. Antigone's single-mindedness has a kind of fascination to it, her idealism a kind of attractiveness. Antigone will not be bothered all the days of her life by niggling little worries about whether any given decision is too much a safe self-serving compromise, or too counterproductively an insistence on principle when compromise might in the long run prove more effective. The "pure" solution has its attractions, indeed. But I don't think that we as feminists can afford to opt for the "pure" solution to our puzzle, the pure solution of separation from power. An adolescent suicide for the ideal--like Antigone's, like Quentin Compson's in The Sound and the Fury, for that matter—is a non-solution for the ailments feminism is attempting to address. But the other extreme, Creon's urbane indifference, his inability to distinguish one crook from another—or himself from either—is no solution either; indeed, it's an escalation of the disease.

What we do have to face is that our position is likely always to be an uncomfortable teetering back and forth, a perpetual negotiation between idealism and pragmatism. As good and also effective feminists, we will need always to face our portion of discomfort, because for the foreseeable future academia cannot be entirely coherent or of a piece for us. In fact, it's positive blessing, I think, to be rescued from the seductions of being completely of one mind about one's own attitudes and actions. Monitoring our own contradictory impulses—toward ideological ideals, toward pragmatism—is no bad life lesson. It should certainly enhance our sympathy for, and consequently our effectiveness with, our colleagues who are not yet very far from pragmatism but making the effort.

In the papers that follow, three members of the Saint Mary's College faculty each explore an individual perspective on the problem of weighing compromise. Ann Loux examines a most particular and annoying case of double message-giving: the fact that some of our most revered female authors seem to have come down personally, in at least some of their works, far too much on the side of compromise--with concomitant sell-out of our ideals (if not by their own lights). Linell Cady moves the analysis to a more general level, as she discusses the problems she encounters as a feminist teaching —and hence apparently endorsing—a rather resolutely patriarchal subject, religious studies. Finally, Julie Jensen looks at what is in some sense the bottom line, publication of what we hold true. She examines the accommodations to popular taste a playwright may need to make if she's to get herself an audience at all, for without an audience, the purity of the message is certainly pointless. All three of these papers illustrate

that judging whether our individual adjustments are an acceptable display of good sense or an unacceptable sell-out is a highly personal and persistently changeable matter. My remarks, and the three papers that follow, aim to provide a starting point for general debate that may help us in private to clarify further our personal calculus of compromise.

KNOW YOUR HEROINES

Ann Kimble Loux, Saint Mary's College

What are we to make of it when our most progressive thinkers seem to be selling us down the river? Women in the vanguard of feminism, women like Virginia Woolf and Lillian Hellman, lead us up to a trough of fresh water and then slip a sedative into it. Today's cinema is merely following suit in a film like "Personal Best." Contemporary theater, too, suffers from the tension between an often ardent feminist aspiration and the equally ardent desire that one's work find an audience. Certainly literature is drawn from and reflects life, but at times I do wish the women authors we look up to served us more consistently as leaders. When a literary character is allowed to break conventional boundaries but then is squeezed back into these same boundaries, under slightly different rubrics, without the author's acknowledging her cowardice, then the reader's aesthetic sense of the work is badly served. The author serves us poorly in terms of consistency with her own principles, honest authorial control, and consistent characterization. Virginia Woolf develops in Orlando a strong and androgynous heroine, but then marries her off to a husband she apparently needs for completion. Lillian Hellman is sympathetic to her heroines in The Children's Hour—apparently—but ultimately their affliction proves destructive, even fatal to one of them. Even today's "daring" theater and film productions, willing to take risks to a point, pull back at the end and restore the "natural" order. Why? Social palatability? Greater sales? A failure of nerve?

I teach early twentieth century British and American literature to the young women of Saint Mary's College. Every semester, though I've taught the course three times now, I agonize anew over the syllabus. One of my teaching aims is certainly to present the students with decent models of women who lead independent lives, and not surprisingly, I—like many of you, no doubt—look to female authors to portray such characters. We can't really expect Ernest Hemingway to create women who are more than limp and shrewish, or Fitzgerald to write about females as stable and moral as his male romantics. But Willa Cather and Virginia Woolf—surely we are justified in expecting them to imagine consistently strong female characters. In fact, both of these authors do raise the reader's expectations that such will be the case. But when these hopes are dashed, by both authors, themselves the best of feminists, the reader understandably feels betrayed.

My Antonia (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946) describes the life of a young Bohemian woman whom Willa Cather knew in Nebraska. Rather than permit her friend to speak for herself, Cather hands over Antonia to a fictional narrator, Jim Burden. Jim—young, sensitive, cultivated, urbane—romanticizes Antonia, eventually describing her in mystic terms as Eve or some fertility goddess seated in a grape arbor surrounded by almost a dozen children within an apple orchard enclosed by two hedges, one of thorny locusts and one of mulberries. Jim is the voice of culture and education; Antonia personifies productivity and natural cultivation. Culture and Civilization take possession of the natural world—Antonia becomes Jim's—hence the title My Antonia.

The final chapter of the book describes Jim Burden's first visit to Antonia after twenty years. He finds her surrounded by a huge if indefinite number of children, ten or eleven, a mix of males and females, yet the chapter is entitled "Cuzak's Boys." Cuzak himself, "not a man of much force," relied upon Antonia's energy and high spirits to keep up his courage in the face of the difficulties of establishing trees in Eden. Like Jim, he is a city man from Vienna—cultured, clever at pruning trees—and he is not strong enough

to carry buckets of water to keep young shoots alive. He names the last chapter; like Adam, he has the words; Antonia does the work. Annoying, this title "Cuzak's Boys"; far more annoying the possession indicated by this title of the final chapter; most annoying, a woman author selling so short the accomplishments of her heroine.

Cather herself never married, never—like Jim Burden—had children. In fact she "shared her life for forty years" with a woman, Edith Lewis, according to her biographer, E. K. Brown. She ordered that all her correspondence be destroyed after her death, and it was. Maybe some of you know something more definite about her personal life, but I don't.

In O Pioneers! (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1941), Cather describes another female of heroic dimensions, with a name to match her deeds, Alexandra. Alexandra singlehandedly keeps the family farm from going under after her father's death, plants crops and invests in land so wisely that she and her two brothers, their wives and children, have a more than comfortable life. She's the matriarch, strong, proud, self-sufficient, and single through age forty. But forty years of being independent suddenly becomes a burden for Alexandra. A childhood friend, of weaker stock—his father had lost the family farm and moved his family to Chicago—returns to visit Alexandra. Over the protest of her two materialistic brothers and in the face of the shock of her younger brother who had thought her happy in her independence, she longs to marry Carl Linstrum. Her older brothers chase him out of town on the rail of gold-digging, and she is left alone until the younger brother is killed and Carl returns to console her. They marry. Another independent woman giving way to loneliness—not really so awful, but enough of a compromise.

But there's more—the extremely troublesome dream life of this heroic woman. She has an increasingly recurrent dream as she grows older:

> . . . she used to have an illusion of being lifted up bodily and carried lightly by someone very strong. It was a man, certainly, who carried her, but he was like no man she knew; he was much larger and stronger and swifter, and he carried her as easily as if she were a sheaf of wheat. She never saw him, but, with eyes closed, she could feel that he was yellow like the sunlight, and there was the smell of ripe cornfields about him. She could feel him approach, bend over her and lift her, and then she could feel herself being carried swiftly off across the fields. After such a reverie she would rise hastily, angry with herself, and go down to the bath-house that was partitioned off the kitchen shed. There she would stand in a tin tub and prosecute her bath with vigor, finishing it by pouring buckets of cold well-water over her gleaming white body which no man on the Divide could have carried very far. As she grew older, this fancy more often came to her when she was tired than when she was fresh and strong. (pp. 205-06)

This first time the dream appears in the text it may be passing tolerable because Alexandra seems to have enough sense to try and scrub it out of herself, and because Cather hints that there were none capable of fulfilling her dream work and thus Alexandra, by implication, must wake up and take care of things herself. The dream could be dismissed as escapist. But after her younger brother's death, very near the end of the novel, Alexandra has an even clearer dream of her partner:

> He was with her a long while this time, and carried her very far, and in his arms she felt freed from pain. When he laid her down on the bed

> again, she opened her eyes, and, for the first time in her life, she saw him clearly, though the room was dark, and his face was covered. He was standing in the doorway of her room. His white cloak was thrown over his face, and his head was bent a little forward. His shoulders seemed as strong as the foundations of the world. His right arm, bared from the elbow, was dark and gleaming, like bronze, and she knew at once that it was the arm of the mightiest of lovers. She knew at last for whom it was she had waited, and where he would carry her. (pp. 282-83)

It's one thing to put up with Snow White waiting to be kissed when that's part of the convention from the start. It's quite another to watch a strong woman longing to be carried off by a bronze-armed, faceless male. Cather can be forgiven for marrying Alexandra off, but what about these dreams? They seem to me inconsistent, disjunctive, aesthetically displeasing, and possibly even morally disturbing: Cather sells out Alexandra; when the going gets rough she longs—passively—for salvation at the hands of a powerful male.

You might want to make a Jungian argument, as did a woman in the discussion of our panel, that one oughtn't really to make so much fuss over this dream which can be seen as simply a reflection of Alexandra's excellent relationship with her male principle within, her animus, possible in the end the reason for her strength and success. If that helps you, good; I find that it only makes matters worse. Alexandra has become Alexander. The animus dominates; the anima lies passive in the bronzed but blurry arms of the animus; the dream represents female passivity as an archetype, universal even within the strongest female.

This second dream occurs very near the end of the novel before Carl's return and the marriage. The dream may be Cather's indication of her own dissatisfaction with the ending she's arranged for Alexandra, her admission that Carl is not her equal, but that Alexandra, Psyche-like, deserves a bronze god. On the one hand, poor Carl; on the other, another idealized woman, transcending the mortals of this earth. I much prefer the resolution in a more or less parallel situation offered by one of my students:

Trust

If I really trusted you
I would jump into your arms.
But if you missed, I would fall
and smash my head
And there I would be
dead.
I
think
I'll
take
the
stairs.

—Susan Simonaitis, 1982

Maybe this young woman will some day write a novel without so many compromises!

I'll close this Cather section with a brief glance at A Lost Lady (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978). No, no, to those who suggested in our discussion that this book offers a suitable alternative for the syllabus. Here a woman stands in partial dignity only

upon her husband's shoulders or shrinks into flimsily disguised prostitution on her own two feet. Her story is almost the embodiment of Alexandra's dream. Yes, Marian Forrester represents the end of the frontier and not herself alone, but she is also an individual, like Antonia given over to the hands of a sensitive young male narrator (frankly, we have more than enough from male writers who do it better). An individual woman, not a lady at all, she lives up to the narrator's description:

> For years Niel and his uncle, the Dalzells and all her friends, had thought of the Captain as a drag upon his wife; a care that drained her and dimmed her and kept her from being all that she might be. But without him, she was like a ship without ballast, driven hither and thither by every wind. She was flighty and perverse. She seemed to have lost her faculty of discrimination; her power of easily and graciously keeping everyone in his proper place. (pp. 154-55)

As one of the participants in our conference suggested, Willa Cather writes better books about men than she does about women. When I get really angry with Cather —The Lost Lady provides fine provocation—I think she's even a bit of a misogynist, hating (or idealizing—much the same in the end) the sex she longed to escape. The answer, as suggested in our discussion, is to read Cather's works about men, The Professor's House, or Death Comes for the Archbishop. More's the pity.

Now to turn to Virginia Woolf. She's the heroine of feminists everywhere with her insistence that women, to be free, must have rooms of their own and money in their pockets. Of course, but just how free are her characters, how free her novels themselves of compromise?

I love Mrs. Dalloway and To the Lighthouse—bless Woolf for them—but these two novels present enormous reading problems to the Woolf novice. They're difficult to follow, to say the least; "Why ever doesn't she have chapters?" my students ask petulantly. The difficulties with these two novels extend beyond style to the choice of two Victorian ladies as heroines. While I may respond positively to the word "lady," most of my students do not; in fact, they bring so much emancipation baggage to these two texts that Woolf often goes down for entirely the wrong reasons.

What about Orlando (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1956), then, much more accessible and immediate in style and content? And things do go wonderfully for several chapters, but then they sour. Orlando is no Mrs. but Virginia Woolf presses her into a double bed. Orlando willingly foregoes the society of the greatest wits of one of her times, Mr. Pope and Mr. Addison, and chooses to let the hours speed by "faster or more merrily" with "witless" ladies of the evening. Orlando longs for solitude, wants more than anything to be herself, to write. And she does. But she also must marry and have a child, apparently because she's a woman. When she meets her androgynous equal, Marmaduke Bonthrop Shelmerdine, Esq., who's also a woman as she's also a man, she proclaims that now she has become a "real woman at last." In the final scene of the novel, Orlando, now a modern woman, calls out for Shelmerdine:

> "Here! Shel, here!" she cried, baring her breast to the moon . . . so that her pearls glowed like the eggs of some vast moon. The aeroplane rushed out of the clouds and stood over her head. It hovered above her. Her pearls burnt like a phosphorescent flare in the darkness (pp. 328-29).

Shelmerdine joins Orlando, and the book closes on "the twelfth stroke of midnight, Thursday, the eleventh of October, Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-eight."

My students ask each year, "Why is this ending so frustrating, such a letdown?" It is, I agree. Virginia Woolf has gone to great lengths to create an androgynous heroine and then closes with a conventional, even gloriously romantic, ending. It jars, disappoints. Somehow an androgynous, self-sufficient woman can't be last seen feeling like a real woman, bare-breasted in the moonlight, awaiting her spouse's descent from the sky.

The problem with this novel, in contrast to Mrs. Dalloway or To the Lighthouse, was pointed out in the discussion of this paper. Virginia Woolf in Orlando has given herself an agenda, an idea book, the idea being a celebration of androgyny in the flesh, a difficult task—characters are friendlier than ideas in the closing pages. Yet in the ending, the idea is exactly what falls short when Orlando so suddenly goes all female and flush. In itself the idea might well be possible to realize.

Why do Willa Cather and Virginia Woolf make so many compromises? Did they want their books to sell, to please their readers? Certainly, in part. Also, as great artists they wanted to be fair to both sexes. Most importantly, they had to acknowledge, even proclaim, the successful fertilization of the female principle by the male principle within themselves. The goal of creating androgyny is an audacious one; that these pioneering steps were marred by sexist conventions is something we need to face.

This paper is deliberately polemical—a bit of an offense before sacred altars. It invites you to agree or disagree with its largely intuitive responses to literature, to save our heroines, or more importantly, to help understand their limitations and present them realistically and sympathetically before our students.

We all work for changes in the academy and in the larger world, but so often face frustration and failure. When we turn to literature hoping to find release and affirmation of our goals, we see, again, limitations, the discomfort of compromise. If we are to be effective, we must face imperfections: in society, institutions, our students, ourselves, our literary heroines. If we acknowledge the enormity of the task, we may find perspective on failures and more satisfaction in limited success.

COMMUNICATION OR COLLUSION? MANEUVERING THROUGH THE MAZE OF PATRIARCHAL THEOLOGY

Linell Cady, Saint Mary's College

I am addressing this question of "selling out or being sensible" from the perspective of a feminist theologian teaching at a Catholic liberal arts college for women. In the next few minutes I want to consider this challenge not only in a general way but personally, in terms of my present teaching context.

This issue is not an easy one to explore. I am too aware that my remarks are tiptoeing through a maze of self-deception that masquerades as sanity and realism. Though my stance no doubt succumbs to some extent to justification of my life choices, nevertheless I shall try to explain why I think feminist theology worth doing and, further, worth doing in a relatively conservative environment.

First, is "feminist theology," if not a contradiction in terms, such a tepid moderating reform that it in effect prolongs patriarchy by making palatable what ought to be rejected outright? One's answer to this, of course, will depend upon how one interprets both "feminism" and the enterprise of theology.

There is some sentiment among feminists which I encountered during graduate school primarily that any discipline which adopts a systematic, rational approach toward deciphering reality reflects a masculine orientation, inevitably distortive and reductive of our world. While there is indeed a danger in restricting ourselves to one mode of apprehending reality, there seems to me a greater danger in ignoring the role that ideas and symbols have in creating the world within which we live. Without the systematic exploration and critique of such ideational systems, we remain shaped by those we have inherited—the product, for the most part, of a select group of educated males.

Greater suspicion of "feminist theology," however, arises, in my view, from assumptions about the character of theological inquiry. Oftentimes theology is conceived as essentially a translation task: each generation rephrases a core "truth" or "experience" which has been revealed at an earlier time—for Christians, in the event of Jesus Christ. Thus theologians, in this view, work at discovering expressions and terms more intelligible to the present age which will faithfully restate the core or essence of past revelation. Feminists are rightly skeptical of theology if it is understood in this way as the restatement of past truth into modern idiom. Theologians themselves, however, have come to question this characterization of their enterprise. One of the lessons of the nineteenth-century quest to distinguish between the essence of Christianity and its discardable cultural accretions is that no such easy separation can be made; in retrospect it is apparent that the fruits of such efforts reflected the assumptions and values of the inquirer rather than any discernible common "essence."

However, such failed efforts are responsible in large part for the twentieth-century realization that theology is to a great extent a constructive task. Though rooted in some community which shares a common history and literature, theological interpretations are not merely restatements of the past. They may begin with a past event or with constellations of images and symbols from the past, but they move beyond this to creating a new interpretation of the human and our world.

I want to emphasize that in principle this creativity is not limited to a revision of the attributes and activities of God but extends to the central symbol of "God" itself. As many of you are no doubt aware, some feminists reject God-talk as inherently male. Such a stance does not render feminist theology a contradiction; rather, it sets as its agenda the creation of a more adequate symbolic framework for structuring our world. The future of feminist theology lies precisely in the creation of symbolic frameworks which do not have the symbol of "God" as their anchor. My reasons for this conclusion are less important to this session's topic than the problems of pursuing this position in my current teaching.

As I mentioned earlier, I teach theology at a Catholic college for women. My students are almost exclusively eighteen to twenty-one years old and products of Catholic backgrounds, many of them having attended parochial schools for their entire education. What does it mean to be a feminist theologian in this context?

I am convinced that it does not mean standing in front of the classroom, pointing out the sexist dimensions of traditional conceptions of God and offering alternatives. First of all, such an approach is counterproductive. Little would be accomplished besides a hostile retrenchment into long-established beliefs. My own awakening to the feminist theological critique occurred gradually; it seems to me that expecting instantaneous conversions on the part of students is neither possible nor particularly desirable. Generally, swift intellectual transformations reflect and encourage ideological attachments more than sustained critical reflection.

Furthermore, the function of religious beliefs in an individual's life renders this "direct tactic" even more problematic. Precisely because religious beliefs structure an individual's worldview, determining the meaning of and values within her life, the consistent attack upon this framework, even for a feminist rationale, is essentially destructive. Somehow it is important to raise critical questions, to expose students to alternative visions, without engaging in a sustained polemic against deeply ingrained theological beliefs. To put it briefly, the make-up of the audience determines what is pedagogically most effective and morally acceptable.

From one perspective, I am clearly advocating "compromise," which some no doubt would consider "selling out." However, one of the distinguishing features of feminist theology is its political emphasis; it is self-consciously trying to overcome the in-house character of traditional professional theology in which the educated and elite conversed among themselves. If this attempt is to succeed, feminist theologians cannot limit themselves to dialogue with like-minded colleagues. Genuine conversation, genuine communication, inevitably requires meeting others in their situation.

The concrete problem which I continually face is discerning that fine line between effective challenge and mere affirmation of too many patriarchal religious conceptions. No theoretical formulas will help here. The longer I teach in the same setting, the better able I am to discern this point. However, it is equally true that I also become more aware of institutional pressures which shade my judgment and inhibit my courage to operate at this boundary.

In a sense I am schizophrenic. For while I think that teaching young, conservative women requires the type of compromise I have been describing, it alone is insufficient. More literature reflecting radical alternatives must be written so that students can be made aware of its existence. And if I am not to stagnate intellectually, I have to write and converse with others who share my theological outlook to some extent. I do

not foresee any solution to my own schizophrenia, nor any end to my dis/ease over how much compromise is for the students' sake, and how much for my own.

AMERICAN FEMALE DRAMATISTS: SHOW BUT NO GO?

Julie Jensen, Notre Dame/Saint Mary's Theatre

Feminists in academic institutions often complain about having to compromise their values and philosophies in the face of reluctant colleagues and administrators. This kind of negotiation, I would suggest, is even more complex and more compromising when we look at the role of American female playwrights, whose potential audience and responsibilities are at once both larger and more diffuse.

Initially, it is important to understand that the craft of playwriting is and has always been dependent upon rather immediate responses, creating effects and moving people in direct ways and on the spot. Consequently, it does some things well; it does other things rather badly. Playwrights succeed when the culture demands largeness of statement and when it accepts being laughed at—those two. In other less sure, less arrogant times, the theatre has also been less articulate in expressing the concerns of its culture. And the post-Absurdist world, quite admittedly, is difficult to codify. It speaks from several points of view, with many voices. Unfortunately, whenever that is the case, theatre suffers from pangs of basic conservatism, born of its essential cooperative nature and its hierarchical structure.

Playwrights are dependent upon a large assortment of other artists, businesspeople, bureaucrats, and hustlers to bring their work to life. No other artist must deal with so many others, nor is any other artist so dependent upon them. Playwrights must forge relationships not only with agents, editors, and publishers, but much more importantly, with producers, directors, actors, designers, publicists, and finally with theatres themselves. And all of the participants are important, some of them of equal importance to the playwright herself. And all of them affect the final outcome. This interdependency sometimes makes for messy art, it frequently makes for messy intent, and it almost always makes for messy radical intent—at least in this country.

When we consider American theatre, we encounter other unique problems. The theatre of other cultures, it is true, thrives on radicalism of all sorts: political, personal, and philosophical. In America, however, there is no tradition for the radical in art. Speculation on the reasons why leads back to academe. The academy, always the bedfellow of the establishment, has cooperated in defining an aesthetic which remains conveniently and comfortably distant from the concerns which would redefine the culture and reorder its aesthetics. It lauds and values the art of the male upper class, and its constituency is both clear and powerful. America asks of its writers and serious artists that they refrain from preaching, yet it demands that they say something. Artists are caught in a double-bind of minutiae. They fail and will continue to fail.

Having said this, I am led to the next and rather obvious question: why is the academy so strong in this country? The answer is simple: because the artistic sector is so weak, and is systematically kept so by a government policy that devotes less public money per capita to the arts than any other civilized country in the world. The Dramatists Guild estimates that in any given year only six or seven American playwrights make a living from their plays. The average writer of any stripe, according to a New York Times survey published in 1982, makes less than $4000 a year from writing. As a result, the academy becomes the halfway house for otherwise beleaguered and ill-appreciated playwrights. And that arrangement, though it might be of some benefit to academe, does little for the artist except perhaps to feed her children—and that it does badly.

In the last ten years, it is true, the academy and the theatre have attempted to sever the umbilical cord. Government subsidies to the arts have helped. The proliferating number of professional regional theatres, as well as the number of off-off-Broadway houses, attests to the success of subsidies. Now, however, Washington is becoming less generous, less cooperative, and is once again forcing theatre back to the only places where it can survive: in the arms of academe or in the blaze of Broadway commercialism.

Given these assumptions—the difficulty drama seems to have in articulating subtler and less sure awarenesses in any culture, the essential cooperative nature of the theatrical form, the lack of a radical tradition in American art, and the thinness of public support for the arts—let us examine some women playwrights in light of radical intent.

In the last three years (1979-1982), the plays of five women have appeared on Broadway or been given extended runs off-Broadway: Marsha Norman's Getting Out, Beth Henley's Crimes of the Heart, Joanna Glass' To Grandmother's House We Go, Pam Gems' Piaf, and Caryl Churchill's Cloud Nine. Both Getting Out and Crimes of the Heart were discovered and produced in a regional theatre, the Actors Theatre of Louisville. They were brought as full productions to New York, where they found homes in off-Broadway theatres or on Broadway itself. Getting Out is a tough play about a woman newly released from prison. It is not, however, a radical play. The assumption at the end is that the central character will make it all right in this world, statistics, experience, and the other 99 percent of the play notwithstanding. Crimes of the Heart is about three dizzy Southern sisters hysterically responding to their sister's act of murdering her husband. The play accomplishes very little except to allow New York audiences to laugh at people different from themselves. Nevertheless, both of these plays demanded significant, proven commitment before they were considered worthy of attention by larger producers and larger audiences. And in fact, had they not come to New York as complete packages from the regionals, I dare say they would not have been produced there at all.

The only other American female playwright to be seen on Broadway in the last three years was Joanna Glass with a play called To Grandmother's House We Go. She arrived there on the strength of her first play, Artichoke, a direct and unflinching treatment of a middle-aged woman in the Canadian Middle West. However, Broadway produced her second play because it deals with an upper-class family from Connecticut and is, all in all, a shallow and predictable piece of work.

The remaining two plays of the five were both British imports: Caryl Churchill's Cloud Nine, and Pam Gems' Piaf, a Brechtian treatment of the career of Edith Piaf—a play which, once again, focuses on self-destructiveness in a female artist. By far the most radical play among all these is Cloud Nine, a play which juxtaposes British imperialism and contemporary sex roles. It is a daring look at every possible nuance of sexual variance, putting the roles in the hands of opposite sex actors with an effect both startling and overpowering. Must we conclude, then, that British writers are better than American? No, of course not. But they certainly do get more support: political, monetary, artistic. That finally says it all.

It is no wonder, then, that Put Them All Together by Anne Commire, a play about a woman forced to kill her hyperactive son, got no further than the WPA Playhouse. And it is no wonder either that Lavonne Mueller's Killings on the Last Line, about ten women in a factory, got no further than the Women's Project at the American Place Theatre. Nor that the same thing happened to Joan Schenkar's Signs of Life, a play about women as freaks, objects for study, and sources of men's creativity. It is also no wonder that the most prolific female playwright, and probably the most experimental,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Megan Terry, works exclusively at the Magic Circus Theatre in Omaha, Nebraska. And it is finally no wonder either that Martha Boesing, founder of the most influential women's theatre in the country, At the Foot of the Mountain, remains in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

American female playwrights do not suffer from failure of imagination. But their instincts and beliefs all too often bump up against the American academic definitions of art or else collide with the opinions of producers, agents, directors, designers, and actors who are full of data about what won't play in Peoria, Detroit, or New York City. They lack monetary support, the luxury of experimentation, and appropriate role models. Above all, they are denied the very essence which America promises in its mythology: a defiance, a will, a vision, and commitment to them. The best of those who succeed are allowed only a flirtation with a new order, never the freedom to pursue it. The re-establishment of the old order is somehow a comfortable and necessary last ingredient.

Feminists in any situation are forced to negotiate a thorny path toward self-actualization. Our negotiations begin with ourselves and our pasts, proceed to our families, our work places and institutions, and ultimately arrive at the culture itself. The playwright reflects all of them and represents more. She demands our support as audience members, our most sophisticated and enlightened response as critics, and our clarity of vision as human beings eager for social change.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATION

THE WHOLE THING: IN SEARCH OF RELEVANCE AND INTEGRATION MADE DYNAMIC BY CREATIVITY

Mary Beth Edelson, New York City

Today I would like to talk about my own art as it relates to two ideas that are very important to me: contemporary feminism and the feminist art community, and the search for a holistic approach to contemporary life. Knowing that some of the young women in the audience today will think that my comments do not reflect your experience, I ask that you listen to what I have to say as part of history—a history that you have not lived through, but that some of us have. I ask you to listen to that history, not just because history assesses and instructs, but because it gives examples for possible future events and behavior. Take what is useful to you and ask questions and give your comments at the end of the talk. I am addressing this especially to the young women, because I'm very eager to hear what they have to say these days. This invitation is not meant to exclude other people, however.

A contemporary woman artist can hardly afford to ignore her community and still hope to remain relevant or dynamic in today's world. No work is truly done in isolation, as is clear from the events of the past ten years. Don't fool yourself; the revolution that women have been involved in is not over. It is in its inception. In truth, because we are in a backlash that has eroded the progress of the 70's, women are again swiftly approaching the position of having nothing to lose. Historically, that position brings about action. I believe we are rapidly forming a groundswell toward a second wave.

The depth of this backlash and its overt hostility surfaced dramatically this past week in an event in New York City. At a dinner that was given to honor Louise Bourgeois before her one-woman exhibition opened at the Museum of Modern Art, the following happened. Members of different groups in the art world toasted Louise, including Lucy Lippard, who toasted her from the feminist art community. Now, Louise Bourgeois has been a very active and supportive member of the feminist art community—she has gone to women's exhibitions, made special attempts to support us by her presence, given work to fund-raisers. As Lucy Lippard raised her glass to toast Louise Bourgeois, Hilton Kramer of the prestigious New York Times hissed her. He hissed her. This is symptomatic of what the backlash has brought us. People have the audacity to confront us openly with bad manners and hostility, which they would not have done a few years ago.

Bad manners and hostility, however, also backfire. Fair-minded people respond by trying to make things right. Fair-minded people are trying more and more to support women, as they notice the blatant backlash against women.

However, women artists continue to be excluded from places of power. I would like to quote from an article that appeared this week in The Village Voice, written by Carrie Rickey, another member of the feminist community who is active in the Heresies collective. Her article, entitled, "Why Women Don't Express Themselves," with the sub-title "Put the Blame on Boys, Mames," points out the dynamic effect of women's art on mainstream art, as well as some of the current stumbling blocks and problems. It is itself also evidence of a mounting second wave.

Talking about the expressionist movement that has hit the art world in recent seasons, and the exclusion of women artists' work from this movement, both in galleries and in major exhibitions, Rickey says, "The systematic exclusion of women expressionist artists deliberately distorts the contemporary situation. A few well-funded male curators have chosen not to look at women." And this is a problem—they don't even look at the work. It isn't that they come and decide it isn't good enough; they don't even look. Rickey continues, "But in fact the art world in the last decade is as profoundly changed as the art. There are more women artists, artists of quality, than ever before. Each of the art journals is now helmed by a woman. Among the museums . . ." (and then she names the women in key positions in museums). "Nationally the most influential galleries are run by women." And she lists the names of the galleries and the women who run them. "So why the ritual elimination of women artists from these major shows? I'd like to put the blame on boys, but we girls are responsible, too," Carrie Rickey writes.

The thrust of Carrie's article is the recent denial of women's expressionist work that pre-dates the new expressionist group. For the benefit of curators, male and female, she lists nearly a hundred names of women artists of quality who work in the expressionist mode. Carrie says that curators have said to her, when she has complained about women's exclusion from expressionist exhibitions, "Well, who are the expressionist women?" She made this list available so they could no longer claim that we don't exist.

If you are an historian or an art writer, who is your dissertation on? Who are your major publications on? If you are a museum person, who are you giving serious professional attention to in your exhibitions? And I'm not talking about showing Georgia O'Keeffe for the hundredth time. Not one museum major exhibition has been mounted to survey the historical 70's, nor has a single major catalog from a museum been published on the subject. Futhermore, I'm also unaware of individual women who came of age during the 70's who have been honored with major solo exhibitions in museums. Some older women like Alice Neel, Louise Nevelson, Georgia O'Keeffe, and now Louise Bourgeois, have had major exhibitions. But consider the importance of the break, the chance to grow, that is afforded artists in mid-career with museum exhibitions. Each of us can think of the young men we know who have had such taps on the shoulder —the current new expressionist movement is a case in point—where as I, and other women artists like me in mid-career, often feel that we have a garbage can lid on our heads. That they will let us go "so far" but they will not let us stand up straight. That they will not let us have our full power and our full strength because of the opportunities that are being withheld. By "they" I am referring to the people who control decision-making in museums, and the major galleries, with their collectors who influence away from supporting women's work.

If you are an artist, you know that you grow when you are allowed to have your work up on the wall next to that of your peers. Then your work has a chance to dialogue with other work to see how it holds up. Of course, this is also when the work gets written about and reviewed in depth—so exclusion from museum exhibitions is a major obstacle for women artists today.

Being under the garbage can lid wears you down, as does vagueness, as does burnout. Women, and especially mothers or mothering types, need nurturing more than most other human beings. The emotional support that we provide for our family, our community, our department, can drain us. As we learn to point out the value and emotional cost of this life-affirming service that we provide, we also need to refuel ourselves. Burnout comes from doing things we don't want to do—from not learning to say "no," not being properly acknowledged, not being nurtured. Faith Ringgold and her

playwright daughter currently have a piece installed in a group exhibition titled "Rhythm and Ritual--Survival Tactics for the 80's." In this piece, the daughter's voice tells us not to listen when we are being put down, not given due, manipulated, etc. She says "Don't listen—walk away. Don't look at the manipulator because gestures and subtle glances affect us and are powerful. Don't look, and don't listen—walk away."

At the same exhibition we are also shown how to renourish through ritual—an old favorite pasttime of mine. Ritual is now being employed as an anti-burnout and as a survival tactic, as well as a method for protesting. In my own work, I have found it to be one important way of creating a holistic approach.

The problems and tasks facing women and women artists today are well-served by a holistic approach—a new vision. I would like to quote from The Turning Point: Science, Society and the Rising Culture, written by Fritjof Capra, and to recommend this book highly. He says:

> It is a striking sign of our time that people who are supposed to be the experts in various fields can no longer deal with the urgent problems that have arisen in their areas of expertise. . . .These problems are systematic, which means that they are closely connected to interdependence. They cannot be understood within the fragmented methodology of our academic disciplines and government agencies. A resolution can be found only if the structure of the web itself is changed and this will involve profound transformation of our social institution's values and ideas, which brings us to flexibility. . . .that is, being able to harmoniously respond to change. . . .When social structures and behavior patterns have become so rigid that society can no longer adapt to changing situations, it will be unable to carry on the creative process of cultural evolution. It will break down and eventually disintegrate. Whereas growing civilizations display endless variety and versatility, those in the process of disintegration show uniformity and lack of inventiveness.

A holistic and flexible approach in the art world manifests itself, not through linear processes—that is, not through a single mode of working and developing—but rather by integrating many elements and modes of expression into a body of work. In my case that process has incorporated exhibiting sculpture and environments that you enter and walk through, where drawings and painting are articulated by the sculptured objects. Photographs on the wall provide documentation from my private rituals. Within these environments I also place tables and some comfortable seating with my "story-gathering boxes." The boxes contain paper tablets with various topics stamped on blank cards. Spectators are invited to write on these cards, and leave the comments for others to read. This provides a way for the viewer to participate in the exhibition and leave some part of himself or herself there. The tables also hold handmade books that further elaborate on the themes of the exhibitions. But to bring it all alive, I must act out, or act on, the theme, most often with a ritual performance presented during the life of the exhibition. All of these elements are integrated into a comprehensive statement that I hope is made dynamic by the energy from unexpected interconnecting modes.

To give you some examples of what I mean, and to illustrate how my work has developed, now I would like to show you a survey of my work through slides and to talk more specifically about those slides. I think of my process as being spiraling and cyclical —that is, I start with certain themes that I repeat over again, hopefully deepening my understanding with each pass on the spiral.

This first slide is an old piece from the 60's. I show this first because I have gone back to this image and it illustrates the cyclical process. I think of it as a figure or a form, a mystical female presence in the universe. In 1975, I returned to that same form and used it in a quilt that I designed. I wanted to show you some of my work from the 60's because a lot of that work is not generally seen, and because people have told me that early work often gives more insight into the person. Most of these works are fairly large paintings, very colorful. I evolved from using a great deal of color in the 60's to using exclusively black and white in the 70's. I was very concerned at that time about what we used to call race relations. My paintings were about black families, white families and integrated families interacting. But I can't tell you how uninterested people were in what a white woman had to say about that in the 60's. So I began to pull away from working in that mode.

These early paintings gradually changed from happy domestic scenes to what I felt was more my own statement. They are all autobiographical. But once I left the domestic scenes, the paintings reflected my psychological environment instead. That environment was somewhat hostile and uninviting to me in the 60's. I felt that there was no way for me to get through it; it was threatening, coming at me . . . I wanted to get to the horizon where it was brighter, but things were always in my way. Typical in these paintings were doorways or passages that were blocked, and the bright horizon, and phallic or finger-like threatening projections.

Another cyclical form which I continue to use today is a rising mountain. Sometimes this form becomes a female form, sometimes a cave, but it's always trying to push itself up out of the earth. The open flower was another form that I have repeated, and that many other women have also used, apparently springing from our collective psyche.

I moved to Washington, D. C. in the early 70's, when painting began to go dead for me. It just didn't have its old energy . . . I wanted to act things out now, to have more interaction with other people than was available working in an isolated studio. I was around other artists who were doing sculptural work and somehow it looked like it was more fun than painting, so I decided to do something else, something quite different. I proceeded to devise the following concept. I asked twenty-two people to come to my studio, look at the work I had done in the past, and suggest a piece that they would like to see me execute. The only stipulation I gave them was that they must not suggest a painting. I then executed these twenty-two works and put them in an exhibition titled "Twenty-two Others."

One of the suggestions given to me was to take one of my passage paintings, which was mural size, and make it dimensional so you could walk through it. I installed the environment in the Corcoran Gallery of Art. I will describe what you're seeing in this slide. On the ground there are waves, like in the painting. The first wave is about forty inches high, made of canvas and stuffed with foam rubber, and it continues going back, one wave after another. The piece is twenty-two feet across and eighteen feet deep. People were invited to walk and jump on the waves—in other words, actually enter it. It has so much foam rubber that it was a little like a trampoline. In the painting, which was from a powerful dream I had in the early 70's, I was entering an environment that was completely flowing and fluid, and I was afraid to go into it because it looked like quicksand. Still, I was so curious about it that I walked into it, and as I got into it, in my dream, it was not frightening but a very elevating experience. In my dream I was, in fact, flying a little off the ground. I tried to re-create that feeling for people in this environment so they could get up off the ground, even for just a short period of time.

The poster that Thalia described in introducing me was another work from this exhibition. One person suggested that I make a work of art in which the political, philosophical and social implications were very clear, and which included an anti-religious statement. As I thought about it, I decided that for me the thing that was most negative about religion was the way it treated women, so I took the painting "The Last Supper" and cut out all the male heads and substituted women's heads. There are eighty photographs of women artists in this poster; in the early 70's you cannot imagine how difficult it was to find photographs of women artists. If I were doing this poster today, I would have thousands of photographs available to me. But nothing was in the archives then, and there was no real network to find anything out, so it was quite a research job to find this many photographs. This piece has been reproduced around the world, and is perhaps the image I am most associated with.

Gene Davis suggested for "Twenty-two Others" that I think about what it felt like before I was born, and then do a piece that would correspond to that feeling. Again I used canvas stuffed with foam rubber, and people were invited to roll on this—it was a very soft, womb-like experience.

I had gone through something quite difficult at the time I did the next piece, and my assistant said to me, "If you had to go through that again, what would happen to you?" That was her suggestion to me: "Make a piece that would reflect that change." I decided I would be totally transformed; and I decided that nothing was a more powerful transformation than fire. This piece was made with a circle of a copper tubing with holes drilled in it, attached to a propane gas tank. When it was turned on and lit with a match, an even circle of fire burned. I have used that circle of fire in many other pieces since that time.

After the "Twenty-two Others" exhibition, I began to make photographs of what I felt were empowering images of women. As I looked around in society, I saw images of women that put us in the position of being either a mother or a whore—nothing that really spoke of our own being or made us feel good. So I began to do photographs that I felt would glorify us, would add to our personhood. This series is called "Woman Rising." In many of these early works I also drew on the photograph or added collage onto it. The photographs "One Black Hole—Two Black Holes" were about pulling in and giving birth to myself. I did this ritual "One Black Hole" in the center of a fire ring. "Goddess Head" is again an empowering image, while "Whale Jump" pulls out of the unconscious a moment of insight—that wonderful feeling, before it's back into the ocean, or into your psyche again. "Moon Mouth" is a very strident feminist image from the 70's, of empowerment, especially sexual. It says, "This is my naked body, not as a turn-on, but as a declaration of personal control over it." Another transformation piece involved photographs of Georgia O'Keeffe and Louise Nevelson. I transformed myself into these women by using heavy make-up and costumes and then drawing on the actual photographs to make myself look as much like them as I could.

This next piece is called "Woman Rising"; one side of the panel presents historical information about women and the other side presents contemporary information. This piece also has two projections with boxes on them. Inside those boxes are story-gathering cards, which invited people to write small stories—mother stories, the story of their lives, father stories, etc.

These figures in "The Goddess Tribe" are cut out of plywood and heavily painted on. When you are in the center of them, you get the sense that they are talking. I added a sound tape because of the suggestion of dialogue between the figures.

Another series that I did was "Blood Mysteries"; this piece was very shocking when it was first done in 1973. I asked people to write menstruation stories, menopause stories, blood power stories, and birth stories, and leave them in the box. The one area that no one would write on was—what? what's still taboo?—menopause. Nobody wants to talk about getting older. And I still have hardly any menopause stories in this box. But on the sheet behind it are taboos from various cultures about blood.

Now coming closer to the present, this exhibition called "Your Five Thousand Years Are Up" was my first public ritual performance. I want to describe it in detail, to give you an idea of how the rituals develop. In the exhibition at the opening there were people sitting on the floor as the performance began. Eleven women from the Feminist Workshop in the women's building sat in the center of the fire ring, chanting. The chants were like isolated sounds; it seemed that we were not talking to each other, but to ourselves. We then chanted a liturgy that expressed my feeling of the emotional history of women in the 70's. First we were isolated, then we came together, but as we began trying to talk to each other we fought because we had been isolated. We didn't have the skills we needed for cooperation; however, we developed those skills through working with each other. And as this happened, we discovered we had a lot in common: for one thing, we were very, very angry. During this ritual, nothing was said in words; it was composed of chanting and sounds. As we came to the anger we began to yell like dogs, like animals—a guttural, primordial sound that came from our very depths. (If you haven't tried doing this, I recommend it as a wonderful release!) When we got the anger out, it then turned into another sound, a very sensual sound of self-congratulation and self-acceptance.

Unknown to the audience, those figures in the back of the slide, which look like several still pieces of sculpture, had people inside of them. They were eight feet tall, towering over the people in the audience; they were very ominous and eerie. While we were chanting, the sculptural forms slowly began to sway, and they lifted off the wall. They glided into the room and around the spectators, echoing and extending the meaning of the chant. As we built into anger, the forms moved through the gallery, helter-skelter. As we congratulated ourselves, the forms began to comfort and sway into each other. As we ended the chant, the forms returned to the wall and we began to make very harmonious, melodious sounds. The women in the sculptured forms then joined us in the center. There was no formal ending to this piece because it went into joy, into celebration, and we began to dance, inviting the people in the audience to dance with us.

Another exhibition I did was called "Proposals for Memorials to the Nine Million Women Burned as Witches in the Christian Era." And, yes, there were nine million women burned over a period of years in many countries. To enter this exhibition you walked through a gate inlaid with photographs of women's hands in the sign of the bull. I was reclaiming this sign, which is often used as an evil eye or hex, as an empowering sign for women because it was sacred to the Goddesses in ancient times. As you walked through the grave toward the back of the room, a ladder made out of copper tubing, again using fire, dramatically sat in the center of a circular table. In medieval times when they didn't want to bother to build a proper pyre for a woman accused of witchcraft, they would sometimes just grab a handy ladder, tie her to the ladder and throw her into the bonfire. So I was using the ladder as a negative symbol but also as a symbol of spirituality, a symbol of being able to transcend a situation. I like to use symbols invested with duality, so the symbol doesn't become fixed and stagnant. Around the base of the ladder on the table were books that you could handle and look through, and also the story-gathering box. The wall display documented a trip that I made to Yugoslavia, to a cave believed to have been used to worship the Goddess. It was a very beautiful cave with coral quartz glistening on the wall. This cave is normally

locked, but I gained entry and did rituals in the cave; this slide documents one of those rituals. Also on that table is a book that I call the Bamburg Book. I went to Bamburg, Germany, site of a famous Hexenhaus where they used to torture women suspected of witchcraft in the Middle Ages. On this book I put rocks that I gathered from that site, to keep that negative energy down. To see what was inside the book you had to ceremoniously lift the rocks and then open the book, which contained photographs and a documentation of what happened in the Middle Ages at that Hexenhaus.

The monolithic form in this next slide again relates back to the mountain and the spiraling processes. It is presented so that you can actually enter its womb-like interior. I have used this form over and over in various ways. This one is called "Sarah's Tent" and refers to the Biblical story of Sarah, who was barren for many years. In her old age she became fertile and her tent began to glow in the desert; at that moment all the women in the area became fertile. This Biblical story is a re-write of a more ancient Goddess myth.

This next work, "Toothless," again refers to a goddess, this time the Celtic goddess called Shelanagig --a goddess of creation, death and destruction. She is said to have a toothed vagina. I thought this subject was especially important for our time, because women in the 70's have often been called castrating. I asked people, both men and women, to sit inside of this piece, and to meditate on the ridiculousness of calling women "castrating" and of the toothed vagina. The view from "Toothless" was a monolithic shape--a very calming, reassuring view. The ritual that we did for this exhibition had to do with purification and with balancing and flying. During this ritual we tried, each of us, to fly, and found that we were unable to fly, so we settled for balancing. We tried balancing on one foot by ourselves, and of course couldn't do that for very long. Then we discovered that if we made a circle and each of us both gave and took support, we could balance on one foot for a very long time. So the end of the ritual, and the point of the ritual, was both giving and taking support and being able to balance yourself in the process.

I began to work more and more with celebration and joy. I felt that I'd had enough of that mourning stuff. If you're angry you have to get it out of your system, but I did; I'm feeling pretty good these days. I began to let myself fully enjoy and celebrate life. This exhibition, which is called "Unfinished Plans for Utopia," tried to address Utopian ideas of cooperation and collective efforts--how we live together, perhaps just for weekends at first. A conference like this is a potential short-term Utopian experiment, for example, where we come together and enjoy each other's company for a short period of time, addressing possibilities. This is what I feel is happening, not only for women today but for other coalitions that are developing around ecological groups, anti-nuke groups, Third World groups, third way human potential movements, and so forth. I think these groups are becoming a very powerful force that can bring us all together.

This slide shows a personal altar called "Keep the Home Fires Burning." I think of fire as being an active element today, related to the destructiveness around us that comes before we rise from the ashes into a new society. Forever optimistic.

Last year's exhibition at AIR called "The Archeology of Trickster Rabbit in Re-Cycled Time" continued this attitude of celebration. I continued to want to lighten myself up. So I got interested in Trickster, the archetypal trickster that you read about in the mythology of many cultures. "The Essential Trickster" is a sly character; you have to watch out for it. It's also androgynous, for "Trickster" can transform itself into male or female. It can perform magic, bring good luck, be an evil character, or be a divine

character, so there is a lot to play with in this character. Egotistical, too—it wants to be the center of attention.

I also began, with this exhibition, to paint again after being away from it for ten years. A story line about tricksters went around the wall, foretelling a whole possible Utopian civilization. Another aspect of this exhibition was to provide archeological and historical proof of Trickster, by presenting clay pieces that I fired outdoors in the ground. These clay works in the glass cases had an ancient, primitive look, and were historically documented from the Early, Middle and Late Manic Periods.

This final slide shows the "Healing Center," which was installed in an exhibition entitled "Ritual and Rhythm: Survival Tactics for the '80's." It is made with a cloth in a bird-like shape on the wall, with a medicine cabinet that opened in the center of the cloth. When you sit down in front of the Healing Center you can either open the medicine cabinet or leave it closed. When it is closed you see yourself in the mirror. A story-gathering box asked people to write about healing and also contained a pamphlet that people could take home. The pamphlet contained excerpts from the chapter in The Turning Point in which he chides the medical profession for not taking better care of our bodies and minds.

This exhibition occurred in a brand-new alternative space in New York City called "Kenkelaba House," which refers to an herb used for healing in Africa. Kenkelaba House is between B and C Avenue on Second Street; the corner of C Avenue is one of the heaviest drug-dealing corners in the entire city. At all times, twenty to thirty young men hawk drugs on that corner, shouting at the people and cars passing by, and nobody is doing anything about it. It may be fitting a fitting way to close this talk, in which I have tried to present my holistic approach to my art, by noting that I made a point of installing my Healing Center on the wall nearest the street: there it could reach not only the healing of the inside, but also the healing that needs to happen on that street.

CLOSING KEYNOTE ADDRESS

WHEN WE DREAM TOGETHER

Barbara Zanotti, Harvard University

I invite you to turn your attention this morning to the meaning and power of feminist dreaming. I want to explore with you who we are as dreamers, how our vision takes shape, and what things form the content of our hopes for ourselves and for the world. I am using the word "dream" to indicate what we struggle for and give our energies to—what we try to embody and actualize in the world.

Let us first remember that women have always dreamed. The history of women's lives and the legacy of women's writings bear witness to that affirmation. Some of these dreams we are only now uncovering, as we end the silencing of women's words and discover women's impression on the direction of history. Yes, women have always dreamed, but now we are dreaming together in radically different ways, across wide geographical distances, and even beyond the constraints of time. Hearing all women's dreams provides us with a sure foundation on which to create the temple of our collective vision. Feminist women know how deeply we need this collective vision if we are to dismantle the multi-faceted structures of oppression that constrict our lives. As we hear one another, unmask old myths, and understand our own and others' stories, we are free to give a language to our dreaming, a language which births a new reality.

A second point to be made in this connection is that our dreaming together is what we might think of as the first passage of our dream. While history does record deep friendships and love among women, it is also true that under patriarchy women have been separated from one another, conditioned to distrust ourselves and each other. These divisions have scarred our heritage. As we overcome these boundaries we bring one another into the process of envisioning. This event requires that chaotic moment of waking up: throwing off who we were supposed to be and searching our roots for who we really are. As we dream together, we are empowered to weave new self-images born of deepened self-understanding. This is a revolutionary and transformative process, a radical political act.

The third element of this mix flows directly from the second: namely, that the power of our dreaming together can be measured by the violence done to women. It is essential to come to terms with the relation between our vision and our victimization. We see in history what has been the fate of strong women who dared to embody their dream. They were exiled, burned, erased, mocked, and thoroughly denied. Many of their words have been lost. Many of their names will never be known by us. But the example of their lives remains, and we can expect nothing less. Today the violence is visible in all the ways women are kept down: attempts to control our bodies, attempts to prevent our assertion in the work force, rejection of our thought, and systematic measures to keep women poor and economically dependent—what is now called the feminization of poverty. And this, as you know, is only part of the story.

Why do we dream, give our hands to struggle? I suggest that our active hopes arise out of a deeply felt imperative. We dare to dream because we feel the enormous gap between actual world conditions and the values that are centered in the marrow of our bones. We also dream because our insights are a profound resource in the present

context. Truly, we stand in a grim moment in history. Nuclearism, hunger, war, and massive poverty are but a few of the dreadful scourges that mark these times. Much of this, I believe, stems from patriarchal reliance on an ethic of force, one that makes rape the central metaphor of our era.

To find a way out of this desperate dilemma, there is an urgent need for alternative visions. Feminist women are critically aware of this need, and that has led us to take our dreaming seriously and to bring forth our untapped abilities as assets for the collective human household. We are finding ways, in every sphere, to bring to the forefront all that has been secluded in the private realm. This is a movement that springs from our passion, our fiery well of anger and love.

Unlike many male utopian ventures, feminist envisioning throws us wildly into the world, guided by an ethic of involvement. We seek to overcome competition with cooperation, hierarchy with shared responsibility, and bureaucracy with face-to-face relations. This is that peace which cannot be secured while patriarchy obtains.

Our vision moves first in our bodies, which are our word in the world. Our actions, as well as our thoughts, are centered in felt embodiment, overcoming the old dichotomies between mind and feeling, spirit and flesh. One of the central insights of feminism is the primacy of feeling: the need to respect and communicate the vast terrain of emotion. Recognizing that this process links the personal and the political, we understand that to deny our feelings is to deny our very selves, diminishing our capacity to be active agents in the world. What flows from this understanding is an affirmation of our sensual power and a confidence in the erotic energy that directs our endeavors. Boldness to trust our sensuality may be one of the strongest roots of our dreaming. It embeds us in the world, connecting us with all living things.

The feminist vision is, above all, one of right relation. What the violence of the patriarchy illustrates is the demonic consequences of fragmentation, isolation, and autonomy divorced from interdependence. The realization is growing among women, and among some men, that this is not worthy of who we are as human beings; that relation and connection are sources of sustenance to be embraced rather than feared. Gradually, many are grasping the essential truth of the deep sociality of all living things. And for many of us, this forms the very center of our spirituality.

In summary, what I have suggested thus far are a few reminders on who we are as dreamers, why we dream, and how our vision takes shape. I want to emphasize again the importance of a collective vision, our dreams as a resource in the present context, and the roots of our vision in felt embodiment, relationality, and responsibility. The content of our dreaming grows from these centers.

To describe the content of our hopes, I want to tell the stories of three very different women whose desires appear to me to reflect the feminist agenda. In 1978 I spent a month in Japan as a delegate to an international conference on nuclear disarmament. In the course of my stay I visited the A-bomb hospital in Hiroshima, where many survivors suffer a lingering death. One women called me to her bedside, saying, "I hope for peace. Will you tell others about us?" I have dwelt on her words many times over the years, sensing in her plea the same dream that has filled the hearts and lives of so many women over the decades. I remember the relentless work of Emily Greene Balch, the courage of Rosika Schwimmer, and the non-violent faith of Simone Weil. I see the woman's hope embodied in the Women's Pentagon Action, in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and in Women's Strike for Peace.

What she and all these women are envisioning is an end to the awful spiral of global violence and the development of a new definition of security. What feminists seek in the search for peace is the servicing of human needs and the production of material conditions to sustain a cosmopolitan and livable world. Further, in our analysis of the roots of war and violence, feminists have gone beyond political theorists by exposing the factor of gender, stressing the inherent violence of male supremacy and the dire consequences of excluding women from the decision-making process. What feminists are affirming is our primary loyalty to other women, beyond the artificial boundaries of national patriotism. We are feeling anew the need to strengthen these bonds and to seek peace outside the limits of male negotiation.

The second piece of dreaming I want to share comes from Marina, a woman in a tiny mountain village in Mexico. Like other women in that small community of about fifty families, she was illiterate, and lacked many of the basic resources required for living. I asked what gave her life meaning. Her response was immediate: "I want my children to be educated, to learn how to read and write." I thought of how deeply this hope has pervaded the lives of so many women: wanting growth and opportunity for our children. Feminists have struggled valiantly toward this end, working for gender-free learning centers. We are committed to the goal of providing a context where children can discover their particular abilities independent of sexual identity. As women have worked on this problem, the violence of the present system has grown clearer: how it has distorted human creativity and drained the springs of human potential. That children are deprived of the education required for purposeful living must be recorded as one of the great crimes against humanity.

But feminists are also recognizing the error of sacrificing our own growth for future generations. This sacrifice has always been women's lot. Our task is to find ways to affirm both, seeing our own development as integrally linked with the well-being of those who will succeed us.

I want to lift out something else about the conversation: namely, what she didn't say. Although she spoke freely about her children and I knew she was married, she said nothing about her partner. I wondered why it is that when adults talk about hopes and dreams we rarely speak of a deepening relationship we might have with a spouse, lover or close friend. What I want to emphasize here is that because feminists affirm relationality as a center of meaning, we seek intimacy and depth in our closest relationships, and refuse an easy compliance with relationships which restrict our energy and creativity. We have finally tapped our potential for deep relational joy, and will be satisfied with nothing less. In this regard, I want to draw your attention to the problem of enforced heterosexuality.

Heterosexuality is a social construct. Although it has been defined as normative, it is merely one avenue of sexual expression. The heterosexual box has kept many people from discovering their own preference, thus keeping them powerless, alienated from their vibrant energy center. Compulsory heterosexuality is a major feature of patriarchal power, serving as a critical tool to keep woman subjugated, and forming one basic expression of the misogyny that pervades this culture. Social homophobia and rigid sexual relations in an anti-body, anti-sensual culture victimize all of us. Awakened lesbians, like myself, have recognized the violence of the heterosexual norm and work to eradicate that evil, just as we do the demons of racism and classism.

Feminist women who are claiming our own sexual needs, becoming active initiators of our sensuality, have come to see how deeply connected this claim is with strengthening the sources of our power, while at the same time recognizing that this is a radical

political act that challenges existing institutions. A major insight has been new-found mutuality, power that is reciprocal and shared. Where that will take us is open to question, but it is critical to assess how our new understanding of power can be brought to the transformation of social systems.

The third story I invite us to reflect on comes from a woman in Nicaragua. She is a Sandinista and had been an active participant in the revolution. Speaking about the reasons for her efforts, she said, "I want a just society where there are no excluded ones." I was immediately reminded of women's faithful attention to the needs of dailiness: food, clothing, shelter, health care, education. Reminded, too, of women's endless toil to secure these resources, particularly in the face of social indifference. I felt the long history of American women's protest, from Harriet Tubman to Angela Davis—a legacy of struggle to place communal good over private gain and to shape an egalitarian social order where human needs are served. Under patriarchy there will always be excluded ones, but feminism lays the foundation for an entirely inclusive social order.

These stories recall our history, strengthen our vision and also raise demanding questions. What are we willing to let go of for the sake of our values? What are we holding on to that prevents the practical attainment of our collective hope? These are central questions, because our dreaming is itself a protest but will remain hollow if not steeped in generous accountability, particularly to those who are most oppressed.

Our dreaming is also an affirmation of faith, a wild belief in our power to take the political order in our hands and midwife it to new models. Central to this process is our primary loyalty to women. Only together—across race, class and national lines—can we shape a moral vision that is grounded in integrity, in care for ourselves, and in responsibility to others. Together we learn to "speak female," freeing the dynamism of female friendship to radicalize all our efforts.

Some may argue that what I have said is utopian, and that utopian dreams are not real or natural. I want to leave with you the question: just what is natural? Is it natural that men oppress women? That whites dominate blacks? Is it natural that the earth is polluted? Or that nations hate one another? Just what is natural?

Feminist envisioning is about a world conscious of its unity, honoring multiplicity and diversity without fear or objectification. It is a celebration of unity and plurality generating a present and a future that we are proud to hand on—one that reflects the best of who we are as common inhabitants of one frail and beautiful planet. Let us remember that our dreaming is a protest, our effort a radical act of faith. Sisters and brothers, let's carry it on.

Eighth Annual GLCA Women's Studies Conference

SEEING OUR WAY CLEAR: FEMINIST REVISION OF THE ACADEMY

November 5-7, 1982

Geneva Conference Center
Rochester, Indiana

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5

2:30 P.M. Film Showing: South Africa Belongs to Us
This film tells the story of Black South African women suffering the triple oppression of race, sex, and class, who took the lead in mobilizing mass opposition to apartheid during the anti-pass campaigns of the 1950's. The participants and others tell their stories, illustrated with historical footage and punctuated by South African music.

4:00 P.M. Opening Session: GLCA Women's Studies: Where We've Been and Where We're Going. The history of the GLCA Women's Studies Program, its glories and struggles, will be recounted by those involved. Beth Reed, former GLCA Women's Studies Coordinator, will be honored, and Kathy Loring, the new Coordinator, will be welcomed—Barbara Caruso, Chair of the GLCA Women's Studies Committee; Ann Fitzgerald, English and Women's Studies, Denison; Jon Fuller, GLCA President; David Marker, Provost, Hope.

7:00 P.M. First Seminar Session: Women's Studies and the Individual

Conference participants will meet in small groups to introduce key issues in Women's Studies, to discuss feminism and personal perspectives, and to meet other participants. Seminar facilitators: Coordinator: Ann Fitzgerald, English and Women's Studies, Denison; Jane Dickie, Psychology, Hope; Gail Griffin, English and Women's Studies, Kalamazoo; Joan Straumanis, Associate Provost and Philosophy, Kenyon; Kathryn Edwards, Biology, Kenyon; Rita Kipp, Anthropology, Kenyon; Syd Schnaars, Counseling Center Ohio Wesleyan; Brenda Bankart, Psychology, Wabash; Susan Figge, German, Wooster; Kathy Russell, Philosophy, Denison; Audrey Glenn, Counseling, Denison.

9:00 P.M. Connecting Groups. Support groups and issue groups will be assigned to rooms at the registration desk.

9:45 P.M. Family Dances: New concepts in folk dance will be introduced and led by Diantha Rau.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6

9:00 A.M. Opening Keynote Address: "Seeing Our Way Clear: Feminist Re-Vision of the Academy"—Margaret V. McIntosh, Program Director, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

10:00 A.M. Second Seminar Session: Women's Studies and the Institution

Conference participants will meet with their assigned seminar group to discuss reactions to the keynote address, to analyze the ways in which individuals function in relation to their institutions, and to identify strategies for change on local campuses.—Ann Fitzgerald, English and Women's Studies, Denison; Jane Dickie, Psychology, Hope; Gail Griffin, English and Women's Studies, Kalamazoo; Joan Straumanis, Associate Provost and Philosophy, Kenyon; Kathryn Edwards, Biology, Kenyon; Rita Kipp, Anthropology, Kenyon; Syd Schnaars, Counseling Center, Ohio Wesleyan; Brenda Bankart, Psychology, Wabash; Susan Figge, German, Wooster; Kathy Russell, Philosophy, Denison; Audrey Glenn, Counseling, Denison.

1:15 P.M. Concurrent Sessions:

Heroine-ism—The concept of "heroinism" will be explored in four short presentations dealing with works by women authors. Margaret Fete will discuss "African Amazons" in the works of francophone African woman writers; Gail Griffin will look at Toni Morrison's Song of Solomon; Pamela Park will speak about Mme. de Stael's Delphine; and Warren Rosenberg will discuss Maxine Hong Kingston's The Woman Warrior. We hope that lively discussion will follow the presentations.—Pamela Park, Modern Languages, Wabash; Warren Rosenberg, English, Wabash; Gail Griffin, English, Women's Studies Coordinator, Kalamazoo; Margaret Fete, Romance Languages, Ohio Wesleyan.

Teaching for Critical Consciousness: Examining Another "Truth" of the Academic Tradition.—The feminist transformation of the academy has been directed to the cognitive and consciousness-raising efforts of women's studies. The next step is to develop a pedagogy which will produce from our institutions persons who can effectively and consciously improve their environments without oppressing others. How can teachers provide students with the tools and insight for commitment to change rather than to the status quo? In this session, we will explore the teaching tools and the factors needed to develop this critical consciousness in female and male students. Then we will ask how such a pedagogy influences teaching sciences and Science itself. The basic works for discussion are from Paolo Freire, Carl Rogers, William Perry, Carol Gilligan, and Evelyn Fox Keller.—Kathryn L. Edwards, Biology, Kenyon.

It's Great to be Female: What to Do When It Doesn't Feel Like It. Techniques of liberating our selves from internalized sexism. This workshop will apply liberation techniques developed in Re-evaluation Counseling to combat internalized oppression. The goal is to see through all the myths with which we have been indoctrinated and recover our birthright of powerful confidence, so that we can take charge of our lives.—Eleanor M. Shapiro, Philosophy, Earlham.

The Sex/Value Shift: Sex Bias and Linguistic Change—The "Sex/Value Shift" is the tendency of sex-linked terms to alter predictably in meaning over time: masculine terms tend to become neutral, neutral

terms become feminine, and feminine terms acquire derogatory connotations. Thus sex-marked terms illustrate the general tendency of linguistic terms to degrade in "value" under certain social conditions (in this case, sex bias). If this phenomenon has characterized the English language throughout its history, it provides a kind of archeological key to past and future linguistic changes, and offers a blueprint for successful linguistic reform.—Joan Straumanis, Associate Provost and Philosophy, Kenyon.

Broaching the Issue: Homophobia—Our culture and the institutions in it make honest, open discussions about homosexuality very difficult. The biases and fears about lesbians and gay men are deeply ingrained. This workshop will give us an opportunity to understand and come to grips with our own attitudes toward and fears of homosexuality. A panel will discuss how this issue is addressed by faculty, administrators and students.—Jane Dickie, Psychology, Hope; Audrey Glenn, Counseling Center, Denison; Eve Adams, Ohio Wesleyan.

Our Great Expectations in Hard Times: A Dickens of a Problem.—All of our colleges have tried in recent years to increase the representation of minorities and women in our faculties and student bodies, and to enlarge our curricula to take better account of the experiences and perspectives of minorities and women. A new atmosphere of austerity and retrenchment threatens to reverse the progress that has been made and to block further improvements. What is happening on our campuses? What are the prospects for the decade ahead? What can be done to limit the damage and to carry forward these critical tasks?—Jon Fuller, President, GLCA; David Marker, Provost, Hope; Myrna McCallister, Librarian, Albion.

3:00 P.M. Keynote Presentation: "The Whole Thing: In Search of Relevance and Integration Made Dynamic by Creativity"—Mary Beth Edelson. A New York artist will talk about her work and its relation to feminist process. Slides will illustrate her presentation.

4:45 P.M. Special Interest Sessions:

An opportunity to share concerns and ideas not elsewhere addressed at the conference. Select one of the following sessions or propose your own. A place will be provided for meeting others with similar interests.

Suggested topics include women in literature, feminist therapy, teaching introductory Women's Studies, student meeting, Women's Studies resources, child care centers on our campuses, women and sports, connecting with women outside of academia, suggested disciplinary sessions.

7:00 P.M. Concurrent Sessions:

The Magdalen Asylum of Philadelphia: A Correctional Institutional By Any Other Name.—The Magdalen Society of Philadelphia was formed in 1800 by an elite group of Protestant men. The primary

goal of the Society was "to restore to the paths of virtue" the fallen women of the community. While their intent may have been laudable, the program they established for the reformation of these women was one of correction and adjustment to middle class values. Although the women were to have voluntarily entered the Asylum, once there they were restrained in their behavior. The reform program emphasized vocational (sewing) training and religious instruction. Although providing a way back to respectable society for some, the Society and the asylum which it operated remained basically an institution biased against the behaviors of the lower classes—a pattern still prevalent in today's correctional institutions. This session will present the history of the asylum and engage the audience in a discussion of women in penal institutions today.—Carol L. Juth, Library, Hope.

Being Sensible, or Selling Out?—What are we to make of it when our most progressive thinkers seem to be selling us down the river? Women in the vanguard of feminism, women like Virginia Woolf and Lillian Hellman, lead us up to a trough of fresh water and then slip a sedative into it. Analogously, what are we to do when feminists —perhaps willy-nilly—are forced by career choices to work in tradition-dominated bastions and always run the risk of alienation or submission? In general, what kind of guidelines can feminists construct to balance the conflicting claims of principle and survival? Linnea Vacca will set the problem in a broad feminist perspective, and moderate the presentation. Linell Cady, Julie Jensen, and Ann Loux will each discuss the problem from her own perspective. Julie Jensen will ask hard questions not only of current theatre overall but also of her own work; Ann Loux will argue why we have a right to expect better of Virginia Woolf and just how Woolf's "retreat in good order" constitutes aesthetic failure; Linell Cady will probe some of the moral implications of compromise generally and personally: is feminist theologian as much a contradiction in terms as is (so the quip goes) Catholic university? We would expect audience involvement to be high and probably cantankerous. We intend to provoke discussion and we look forward to a lively debate. —Linnea Vacca, English; Linell Cady, Religion; Julie Jensen, Theatre; Ann Loux, English, St Mary's College.

All-Female Mathematics Classes? A Classroom Experiment—This paper presents research on Basic Mathematics and women, experimenting with an innovative approach to solving the problem of inadequate mathematics training of women. Findings from this research have implications for the mathematics education of adult women.—Pansy Brunson, Math and Computer Science, DePauw.

Violence Against Women: Pornography, Incest and Therapeutic Issues—This session will include research on the relationship between pornography and violence against women, a personal perspective on incest, and a discussion of these issues from a therapist's perspective. Janet Swim will present a paper entitled "Captured Angel in the Centerfold," a feminist view of pornography as not simply the depiction of sex but the violation and exploitation of women and men. The presentation offers a comparative view of early and

recent research into the relationship of pornography and actual violence against women. Karmen Meyer will present a paper entitled "The Hurt That Lasts Forever", a personal perspective on incest, including resulting emotional trauma, current misperceptions, and positive suggestions for educating children. Marci McCaulay will moderate the discussion and will discuss therapeutic issues related to violence against women.—Janet Swim, Hope; Karmen Meyer, Hope; Marci McCaulay, Psychology, Denison.

The Power of the Image: Film Viewers, Film Makers—Starla Stensaas will compare the images of women in two short films, one of which she produced. The films will be used to illustrate the subtle and not-so-subtle ways women are portrayed in limited roles.—Starla Stensaas, Publications Specialist, Earlham.

Broaching the Issue: Racism.—Racism is an often unrecognized problem at our predominantly white colleges. This session will focus on our own attitudes and actions we can take on our campuses to combat racism. A panel of persons representing faculty, administrative and student concerns will begin the discussion. —Margaret Fete, French, Ohio Wesleyan; Pam Pleasant, Kenyon.

9:00 P.M. A Performance by WomanShine.—Indiana songwriters and Woman's Word, a theatre production, will present poetry, drama, letters, and journals by women writers to celebrate the cycles, renewal, and strength in women's lives. This will be a celebration of the diversity and universality of women's experiences.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 7

9:00 A.M. Concurrent Sessions:

Black Women in the Arts.—This session will present research on specific Black women artists and will examine special considerations involved in research on Black women. Thalia Gouma-Peterson will present a paper entitled "Elizabeth Catlett: The Power of Human Feeling and of Art," which will be accompanied by slides of Catlett's work. Although she is "a member of four exploited groups—Blacks, Mexicans, women, and poor people," Elizabeth Catlett considers herself one "of the fortunate." For her the creative urge, survival, and service to her people have been consuming necessities reflected in her art. Josephine Wright will present a paper entitled "Black Women in Cultivated Art Music: Continuity of a Historical Perspective." Until recently the achievements of Blacks in cultivated art music have generally been neglected in scholarly discussions of American music. A few recent studies have focused upon the role of Black women in the performing arts, concentrating upon a small group of 20th-century pioneers without placing their achievements within the context of Black cultural history. Black women have been involved in cultivated art music in the U.S. for more than 130 years, not only as performers but as teachers, composers, and entrepreneurs. Wright's paper will briefly explore the concept of historical continuity in research of Black women in art music, and the ramifications of such investigation for Black

cultural history.—Thalia Gouma-Peterson, Art History and Women's Studies, Wooster; Josephine Wright, Music and Black Studies, Wooster.

The Emergence of the Woman Scientist.—This session presents a discussion of the evolution of the role that women have had to play in science over the past 300 years—from the early women amateurs who tended to work alone; to the semi-professional roles of translators, teachers, textbook writers, and lab technicians; to the fully educated professional scientist as she emerged at the end of the last century. Finally, we will look at the further emergence of the fully accepted woman scientist.—Laurel G. Sherman, Oberlin.

Motherhood and Other Myths: Cross-Cultural Explorations.—Brenda Bankart will compare Japanese and American views of motherhood. U. S. data reveal a positive relationship between liberal attitudes toward women and the rejection of idealized attitudes toward motherhood. While men are more traditional in their views about motherhood, younger, unmarried women are more likely to accept the myths (idealization) of motherhood than are older, married women. In Japan, a highly family-centered society, men and women are more conservative in their attitudes toward women than Americans. Within this context, however, younger, unmarried women are less likely to accept the motherhood myth than are older, married women. That is, Japanese mothers tend to endorse the idealized role while American mothers do not. Marigene Arnold will explore two archetypes of female behavior in Mexican culture in a paper entitled "Timidas y Gallonas: Images of Women in Rural Mexico." This session will raise questons about the strength of the motherhood myth in women's lives today.—Brenda Bankart, Psychology, Wabash; Marigene Arnold, Sociology and Anthropology, Kalamazoo.

Education Through Feminist Theatre.—Feminist theatre is a vehicle for re-examining underlying sex-role stereotyping, and for illuminating paradoxes inherent in the human experience. Feminist theatre takes the private, interior experiences of women and makes them political by publicizing them. Those interior experiences reflect issues such as relationships, parenthood, work conflicts, creativity, and aging, which are often discussed but seldom articulated in a manner that encourages response as clearly as does the medium of drama.

The aim of this session is to offer participants a first-hand experience with feminist theatre readings, and to demonstrate the value of feminist theatre groups as educational resources. Specific objectives are to use experiential techniques and generate audience discussion, to explore the history and goals of a theatre group in the context of its genre, and to recommend uses of community theatre in campus settings. Participants will also receive a bibliography of selected readings on the subject.

The session will consist of a naturalistic interview with members of the WomanShine theatre group, Indiana's only feminist theatre

company, and readings by the group of selections from several of their dramas and anthologies.—Sid Reger, Adult Education, University of Indiana.

Revision or Rejection: Women and Religion in the Twentieth Century.—A critical question for many people in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been the contradictions between feminist principles and traditional religious teachings about women. Focusing primarily on twentieth-century Christianity, Barbara Zanotti will discuss how the work of Mary Daly formed a watershed in clarifying those contraditions for many people, leading to two types of responses. Some feminists, rejecting Christianity as patriarchal, have sought out other spiritual forms such as Wicca or goddess worship. Others have worked toward revision within the established church, through language reform, the ordination of women priests and ministers, and the reinterpretation of Scripture.

The contradictions and the challenge to religious identity have been painful for many persons and many churches, and are emblematic of the contradictions faced by women in the larger society. Following Barbara Zanotti's presentation and a response by Sarah Beth Terrell, this session will invite the audience to discuss the issues raised.—Barbara Zanotti, Ethics and International Relations, Harvard Divinity School; Sarah Beth Terrell, Campus Ministry Coordinator, Earlham.

10:30 A.M. Community Meeting

This meeting provides an opportunity to make announcements and brief reports of general interest and to raise women's studies issues that participants consider especially important to address through this conference and within our colleges.

11:15 A.M. Closing Keynote Address: "When We Dream Together"—Barbara Zanotti, Harvard Divinity School.

12:30 P.M. Buffet Lunch - Conference Ends

Conference Planning Committee: Chair, Jane Dickie, Psychology, Hope; Barbara Caruso, English, Earlham; Ann Fitzgerald, English and Women's Studies, Denison; Gail Griffin, English, Kalamazoo; Kathy Loring, GLCA Women's Studies; Marci McCaulay, Psychology, Denison; Juliana Mulroy, Biology, Denison; Jami Peelle, Library, Kenyon.